Department of Justice Canada
Ministère de la Justice Canada

WORKING DOCUMENT

Best Practices and Lessons Learned: Multidisciplinary and Integrated Justice Projects

George Kiefl
Research and Statistics Division

March 1999

WD1999-2e

UNEDITED

The present study was funded by the Research and Statistics Division, Department of Justice Canada. The views expressed herein are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the Department of Justice Canada.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary ..... iii.

1. Background & Context ..... 1.
- 1.1 Multidisciplinary Approaches to Justice ..... 1.
- 1.2 Multidisciplinary Approaches & Integrated Justice ..... 1.
- 1.3 Integrated Justice Initiative ..... 2.
- 1.4 Purpose & Aim of the Project ..... 3.

2. Responses: An Overview ..... 5.
- 2.1 Types of Responses ..... 6.
- 2.2 Responses: The Numbers ..... 6.

3. Analysis ..... 8.
- 3.1 Best Practices & Lessons Learned ..... 8.
  - 3.1.1 Consultations ..... 8.
  - 3.1.2 Partnerships & Credible Agencies ..... 9.
  - 3.1.3 Engaging Communities & Following Protocol ..... 10.
- 3.2 Outcomes & Benefits ..... 12.
  - 3.2.1 Community Development ..... 12.
  - 3.2.2 Reduced Costs / Improved Efficiencies ..... 13.
  - 3.2.3 Reduced Crime / Victimization ..... 15.
- 3.3 Project Types, Characteristics & Targets ..... 16.
  - 3.3.1 Community Partnership Projects ..... 17.
  - 3.3.2 Justice System Coordination ..... 18.
  - 3.3.3 Inter-System Cooperation ..... 20.
  - 3.3.4 Holistic Approaches ..... 21.
  - 3.3.5 Comparing Integrated & Multidisciplinary Projects ..... 23.

4. Conclusions ..... 26.
- 4.1. Bests Practices ..... 26.
- 4.2 Outcomes & Benefits ..... 26.
- 4.3 Classifying & Analyzing Projects ..... 27.
  - 4.3.1 Different Partnership Orientations ..... 27.
  - 4.3.2 Internal & External Integration ..... 27.
  - 4.3.3 Targets & Benefits ..... 28.
- 4.4 Thinking about Integrated Justice ..... 29.
  - 4.4.1 Toward Integrated Justice ..... 29.
  - 4.4.2 The Role of Multidisciplinary Approaches ..... 31.
  - 4.4.3 Assessing Integrated & Multidisciplinary Justice ..... 32.

List of Figures

Figure 1: Integrated Justice — A Working Definition ..... 3.
Figure 2: Integrated Justice — Objectives ..... 3.

List of Tables

Table 1: Multidisciplinary Justice Call-Letter — Contacts ..... 5.
Table 2: Responses — by Type ..... 7.
Table 3: Working Sample Size ..... 7.
Table 4: Partnership Orientation by Project Type ..... 23.
Table 5: Targets & Outcomes — by Partnership Orientation ..... 24.

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Multidisciplinary Justice Call-Letter – Questionnaire ..... 33.
Appendix B: Integrated Justice Call-Letter – Questionnaire ..... 34.
Appendix C: Previous Multidisciplinary Justice Working Group Materials ..... 35.
Appendix D: Responses — by Jurisdiction & Type of Submission ..... 36.
Appendix E: Projects Providing Best Practices / Lessons Learned Information ..... 40.
Appendix F: Verbatim Responses: Best Practices & Lesson Learned ..... 43.
Appendix G: Summary Analysis: Partnership Orientation ..... 56.

Executive Summary

CONTEXT

During the June 1996 meetings of Deputy Ministers Responsible for Justice discussions were held concerning the two related topics of multidisciplinary approaches to justice problems and integrated justice, and Deputies asked that work be undertaken in each area. In August 1996, Deputies agreed that the work, and the two groups addressing the work, be merged into what is now know as the Integrated Justice Initiative.

In summary, Deputy Ministers asked officials to undertake the following work:

1. produce a compendium of multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects from across the country;

2. develop a report on best practices and lessons learned in multidisciplinary and integrated justice;

3. explore the possibility of undertaking select evaluations of existing, exemplary multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects;

4. explore ways in which non-governmental organizations (NGOs) could be better involved in justice projects; and,

5. explore the role of, and potential for, integrated justice in the areas of family, civil and criminal law.

The Multidisciplinary Justice Research Sub-Committee undertook to address elements of three tasks:

- a compendium of multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects;

- a report on best practices and lessons learned; and,

- possible evaluations of promising, exemplary multidisciplinary justice projects.

Initially, the Research Sub-Committee worked in conjunction with the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics to develop the requested compendium. The Compendium, created using submissions from the jurisdictions on both multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects, was tabled for Deputy Ministers in 1997 and made public by the CCJS as *Compendium of Canadian Integrated and Multi-disciplinary Justice Initiatives*. The compendium was later up-dated and tabled for Deputy Ministers at their March 1998 meetings in Victoria.

Following the completion of the compendium, the Multidisciplinary Justice Research Sub-Committee began developing the requested report on best practices and lessons learned through

an analysis of the submitted projects. This report represents the culmination of that effort, and begins exploring the work on evaluations through a discussion of next steps.

Main Findings

Through an analysis of the responses to the best practices and lessons learned question, it became clear that a majority of responses addressed necessary aspects of undertaking multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects rather than particularly successful or effective practices in developing successful justice projects. Factors such as 'undertaking consultations,' for instance, or 'involving partnerships,' were listed as best practices for a number of projects. These kinds of activities are necessary elements to developing multidisciplinary and integrated approaches, as opposed to particular practices that lead to effective multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects. As such, it appears that respondents understood the question in terms of providing successful and exemplary projects rather than delineating particularly successful practices. This changed the nature and objectives of the project and this report somewhat; nevertheless, a few projects did provide some information insights into best practices and lessons learned.

1. Best Practices:

Three related elements comprise the best practices (i.e., processes which assist in developing successful multidisciplinary justice projects, as opposed to exemplary projects *per se*) identified from the submitted projects:

- early consultations play an important role in effectively engaging partners and developing meaningful partnerships where all parties involved assume a degree of ownership over a project;

- in a related manner, partnerships must be genuine in order to be successful. While early consultations will impact a community's likelihood of accepting an invitation to participate in a multidisciplinary or integrated justice project, there is a need to go beyond the formality of consulting by developing genuine partnerships where there is equality amongst partners and openness to allow all partners the opportunity to help determine the role and nature of the project; and,

- the development of successful, genuine partnerships involves effectively engaging communities and partners in the decision making process, and thereby instilling ownership over the project (and justice issues generally). Developing real ownership (or "buy-in") on the part of partners is related to respecting the needs and desires of partners, ensuring that all partners are comfortable with other partners, ensuring that all implicated and involved agencies are seen as credible, and being sensitive to protocols and other related matters that partner agencies may have or may bring to the partnership.

2. Outcomes & Benefits:

Three main kinds of benefits and outcomes emerged from an analysis of the submitted projects:

- multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects have an impact on the community generally, in the form of community development. Community development may be seen as comprising an improved sense of community, an increased community awareness, and increased community interaction;

- a number of multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects reported objectives or results of reduced costs and improved efficiencies in the justice system; and,

- a variety of projects reported outcomes and benefits relating to crime, including reduced crime and fear of crime, and reduced victimization.

3. Partnership Orientations:

As the analysis progressed, it became clear that there were differences in partnership orientation that seemed to be important in further exploring multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects. Based on the apparent primary partner, it was possible to develop a classification system as follows.

- Community Partnership projects represent an initial step in external integration (i.e., integration with non-justice system partners) wherein justice agencies partner with affected and interested communities to address a justice problem.

- Justice System Coordination are projects with an orientation toward internal integration (i.e., integration within the justice system itself) where justice system agencies become more involved with other justice system agencies with the aim cooperating to integrate and coordinate their work.

- Inter-System Cooperation projects, which seek to improve cooperation between the justice system or agencies of the justice system and other public systems (e.g., education), represent a different, perhaps more complex, kind of external integration.

- Holistic Approaches may include elements of community partnerships, justice system coordination and/or inter-system cooperation. They may also have unusual partners such as a very specific community group or may have a very specific target group. However, these projects share a different commonality: they have adopted an orientation toward developing complete and holistic responses to problems rather than adopting an orientation around a particular kind of partnership.

4. Differences Between Multidisciplinary & Integrated Justice Projects:

Looking at the projects within this classification, it is apparent that multidisciplinary projects and integrated projects have different orientations:

- all of the submitted integrated justice projects, except one holistic approach project, were classified under justice system coordination. This finding suggests that integrated justice projects appear to be primarily concerned with internal integration — as noted above, internal integration refers to integration within the justice system; and,

- the submitted multidisciplinary justice projects tended to be classified under the categories of community partnership projects or inter-system cooperation projects. Being more likely classified under community partnership and inter-system cooperation, it seems that multidisciplinary justice projects are more oriented toward external integration — as developed, external integration refers to integration with non-justice system partners be they the community or agencies of other service systems. However, it is true that multidisciplinary justice projects were classified under all four categories of projects, suggesting that multidisciplinary justice may be more flexible in engaging more varied partners than integrated justice projects.

Aside from these differences in orientation, there were nevertheless clear similarities between multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects in terms of the targets and outcomes of projects:

- both multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects had similar justice-system as well as similar social-community targets and objectives. In terms of specific targets, both multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects tended toward the targets of crime prevention, community development, reduced use of the traditional justice system, as well as assisting victims and traditionally disadvantaged groups;

- both multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects may lead to the benefits of a more focused use of the justice system, and some form of reduced costs or improved efficiencies. Regarding specific outcomes, both multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects achieved similar outcomes and benefits, including improved community ownership over justice issues, reduced offending, and improved efficiencies and cost effectiveness.

IMPLICATIONS

1. Access to Justice

Looking at the overall benefits and impacts of multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects, it is possible to see these projects as all contributing to the advancement of access to justice. Access to justice has a long history and includes efforts such as legal aid, public legal education and information programs, as well as court-based efforts such as the native courtworker program. These kinds of efforts all represent attempts to provide individuals and historically disadvantaged groups with better and more equal access to justice and justice-related services.

Multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects also fall within the continuum of efforts to improve access to justice. However, there's a distinction to be made between multidisciplinary and integrated justice approaches and the previous programmatic approaches such as legal aid or

104-05898/

native courtworker. Multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects are not programmatic approaches and the main objective is not to improve access to justice services. The objectives of multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects, beyond the specific project-determined objectives, are to improve access to the development of justice projects and to decision-making in the justice system.

As such, these kinds of projects are engaging citizens in the development of the justice system which is likely to impact a number of factors of interest to the justice system, including:

- people's respect for the law, the justice system and agencies of the justice system;
- citizen's awareness and understanding of the law and the justice system; and,
- people's willingness to participate in the justice system as witnesses and volunteers.

In this light, multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects have great potential for improving access to justice not just in traditional access to justice areas such as legal aid and courtworker problems, but also in other areas such as:

- restorative justice;
- alternative dispute resolution;
- crime prevention;
- community development; and, generally,
- social cohesion.

2. Comprehensive Integrated Justice

If one thinks about what integrated justice means — leaving aside any formal definition for the moment — there are a number of ways one could view integrated justice. For example, one could see any attempt to work with non-justice system partners in a multidisciplinary fashion as integrated justice, at least to a degree. However, simple or strictly multidisciplinary partnerships fall short of a more complete view of integrated justice. A more complete or comprehensive view of integrated justice would not only involve multidisciplinary partnerships, but would also look beyond project or problem oriented attempts to integrate work and look toward the integration of policy development and decision-making across all agencies involved in social policy issues.

The idea that integrated justice is a process of developing integrated policy development — integrated with community desires and community needs, and integrated with other public service systems such as health, education, social services, *et cetera* — raises other questions. The projects submitted only rarely represented projects which attempted to develop integrated

policy development and decision-making. However, this objective was noted and some problems and questions were either raised or implied about what needs to be known to further integrated policy development and integrated decision-making, including:

- it is problematic to determine *who should represent the government*, for *whom government representatives spoke (the Department?, themselves?)*, and *ensuring accountability for all members / partners*. If the desire is to develop mechanisms by which integrated justice can develop, there must be some sort of established or accepted determinations of role and of representation;

- there are difficulties surrounding *defining a workable meaning for "inclusivity"* and, *defining partnership criteria*. It is not enough to bring people together with good intentions of developing integrated policies, it is necessary to create parameters for inclusion in this kind of decision-making process and ensuring that there is agreement both on who does and does not get included; and,

- there are problems in *developing a non-hierarchical structure*, and *establishing a decision making process and criterion*. Implicit in the idea that policy making may be addressed through integrated decision-making is the idea that there is some level of equality of importance across involved institutions such that, for example, the justice issues do not necessarily take precedence over the health issues in any one particular social policy area. As such, a non-hierarchical structure is an important element in developing structures, which promote integrated policy development and integrated decision-making process.

This kind of comprehensive integrated justice is therefore more of a process than a project or initiative as traditionally understood in the public sector. In theory at least, any public policy issue could be addressed using an integrated policy development model and employ a multidisciplinary approach to program delivery. As the above noted questions suggest, however, there needs be more work done to better understand how to develop and overcome some of the barriers and problems in developing integrated decision-making mechanisms.

1. Background & Context

This section provides a brief description of the context of this report and the related work of the Multidisciplinary Justice Research Sub-Committee, a small sub-group within the wider Federal-Provincial-Territorial Integrated Justice Initiative. The Research Sub-Committee is comprised of researchers and policy officials from a number of jurisdictions and the Federal Department of Justice assumed the report writing task.

1.1 Multidisciplinary Approaches to Justice

At their June 1996 meetings, Deputy Ministers asked that the Multidisciplinary Justice Working Group conduct the following further work:

1. identify and compile promising, exemplary multidisciplinary justice projects from across the country;

2. develop a report on best practices and lessons learned in multidisciplinary approaches to justice;

3. explore the possibility of undertaking select evaluations (i.e., two or three) of existing, exemplary multidisciplinary justice projects; and,

4. explore ways in which non-governmental organizations (NGOs) could be better involved in multidisciplinary justice projects.

Subsequently, officials came together and it was decided that a Research Sub-Committee would be created to pursue some of the work. Upon consideration, the Research Sub-Committee felt that it could adequately address elements of the first three tasks: a compilation of projects; an analysis of best practices and lessons learned; and, an initial exploration of possible evaluations.

The Research Sub-Committee initiated a process for collecting the information needed to accomplish this work during the summer of 1996, shortly after the Deputies request. A call-letter was released to officials from all jurisdictions, dated August 13, 1996, with a request for responses by early September 1996 (see Appendix A for a copy of the multidisciplinary justice questionnaire).

1.2 Multidisciplinary Approaches & Integrated Justice

At their June 1996 meetings in Whitehorse, Deputy Ministers not only asked that work be undertaken on multidisciplinary justice, they also requested that officials explore integrated justice. Deputy Ministers asked that a new federal-provincial-territorial working group be formed to:

1. develop a compendium of integrated justice projects from across the country in order to make examples and sources on integrated justice available and to enhance people's understanding of the range and scope of projects which have adopted the objectives of integrated justice; and,

2. to conduct work in exploring the role of, and potential for, integrated justice approaches in the areas of family, civil and criminal law.

Officials came together to address the Deputy's request and to set in motion the work of compiling projects and exploring integration in the three areas of law. It was agreed that existing committees in the areas of family, civil and criminal law would undertake to explore the role and potential for integrated justice in these areas. Toward developing a compendium, a call-letter was released on July 4, 1996 asking all jurisdictions for projects, which exemplify the objectives and principles of integrated justice (see Appendix B for a copy of the Integrated Justice questionnaire).

1.3 Integrated Justice Initiative

Following the initial work of officials in releasing call-letters for both the multidisciplinary and integrated justice work and discussions and concerns about replication, at their August 1996 meetings Deputy Ministers agreed that the work should be merged and the current F-P-T Integrated Justice Initiative took shape.

In its current form, the Integrated Justice Initiative consists of five sub-groups and an umbrella Coordinating Committee. The sub-groups and their areas of work are as follows:

- Civil Justice Committee — integration in civil law.
- Family Law Committee — integration in family law.
- Coordinating Committee of Senior Officials (Criminal Law) — integration in criminal law.
- Multidisciplinary Justice Research Sub-Committee[1] — multidisciplinary approaches to justice problems; and,
- NGO (non-governmental organizations) Sub-Committee[2] — involvement in integrated and multidisciplinary justice.

Part of the Coordinating Committee's initial tasks involved defining terms and setting the work in motion. A working definition for Integrated Justice was proposed to, and considered by, Deputy Ministers at their September 1997 meetings in Banff. The working definition also included two objectives.

---

[1] The Multidisciplinary Justice Research Sub-Committee is the research arm of the former F-P-T Working Group on Multidisciplinary Approaches to Justice which was subsumed under the Integrated Justice Initiative in August 1996.

[2] The NGO Sub-Committee was initially formed as part of the F-P-T Working Group on Multidisciplinary Approaches to Justice in order to explore how to better involve NGOs in multidisciplinary justice projects and initiatives. The Group held a meeting with select NGO groups in the summer of 1997 and, after consideration, decided that it was best to wait until more of the Integrated Justice Initiative work was completed before further pursuing their work.

Figure 1: Integrated Justice — A Working Definition

Integrated Justice is an approach to dealing with justice-related problems that involves linking or drawing together different players in order to enhance effectiveness and efficiency, especially:

a) meshing the justice system with other ways of dealing with problems (other disciplines);

b) merging jurisdictional responsibilities or funding responsibilities (both among levels of government and across borders at the same level);

c) making connections for individuals among separate parts of the justice system and between the justice system and other services, in order to provide seamless service (to have the justice system look and act like one system and to respond to people's actual needs); and,

d) designing compliance initiatives to use a range of responses, including those which rely on bodies outside the justice system for enforcement, in order to achieve compliance with a public policy standard while minimizing government's direct role.

Figure 2: Integrated Justice — Objectives

1. *providing a service to the public that is rational, harmonized and, to the extent possible, seamless; and,*

2. *attempting to resolve underlying problems, rather than just deciding disputes.*

1.4 Purpose & Aim of this Project

As noted above, the Multidisciplinary Justice Research Sub-Committee aimed to address elements of three of the tasks assigned by Deputy Ministers:

1. a compilation of multidisciplinary justice projects;

2. a report on best practices and lessons learned in multidisciplinary justice; and,

3. possible evaluations of promising, exemplary multidisciplinary justice projects.

As a result of the August 1996 decision to merge the work, both multidisciplinary justice and integrated justice projects have been included in the requested compendium. The Research Sub-Committee worked in conjunction with the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics to complete the

compendium, which was provided to Deputies and made public in 1997.[3]

While the projects submitted in response to the Research Sub-Committee's call-letter have been included in the *Compendium*, a compilation of the projects submitted in response to the multidisciplinary justice call-letter has also been produced in relation to the development of this report. In part this was done because, as requested, the *Compendium* only provides excerpts from the project submissions. The prepared compilation of project submitted in response to the multidisciplinary justice call-letter includes the answers submitted to all questions. It was felt that officials would benefit from the opportunity to review particular submissions in depth. Therefore, a document, entitled *Multidisciplinary Justice: A Compilation of Projects*, is available in both official languages through the Research & Statistics Division of the Department of Justice.

Working from the project information contained in the compilation document, this report represents the result of the work on the best practices and lessons learned aspect of Deputy Minister's request.

The exact nature of this project, however, has changed since its initial conception. Following Deputy Minister's discussion and request in June 1996, the project initially set out to solicit the best practices and lessons learned in undertaking multidisciplinary justice projects. The kind of information sought was particular practices, approaches or factors within the general multidisciplinary approach that proved to be useful, or those that offered lessons to be avoided in the future. The thinking was, essentially, an attempt to gather information about successful and effective processes in developing multidisciplinary justice projects, not about collecting examples of successful projects. However, for any of a number of reasons, the majority of respondents submitted information about successful projects rather than about successful and effective processes behind these projects. Furthermore, where information on processes was provided, the information was often about relatively basic necessities in developing multidisciplinary projects such as consulting with interested groups or developing partnerships with other implicated agencies. As well, as noted, the work on integrated and multidisciplinary justice has been combined.

As a result, the focus of this report is somewhat different from its initial conception. Rather than a strict focus on analyzing the successful and effective processes used in developing multidisciplinary justice projects, the report examines the best practice projects submitted, the types and aims of these projects, and the benefits and outcomes associated with these best projects, as well as similarities and differences between multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects.

The third element of the work to be addressed by the Research Sub-Committee was also begun through the call-letter and this report. However, it has since been decided that this work will not be pursued.

---

[3] Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, *Compendium of Canadian Integrated and Multi-disciplinary Justice Initiatives*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, February 1997. An up-dated version of the *Compendium* was also prepared in March 1998.

2. Responses: An Overview

The Multidisciplinary Research call-letter of August 1996 was sent to all thirteen jurisdictions aimed at contacts working in justice ministries from across the country (see Table 1). Due in part to the similarities between the multidisciplinary and integrated justice call-letters, there were delays in receiving responses as many contacts called for clarification and to express a sentiment that the work was similar and that the work should be merged.

Table 1: Multidisciplinary Justice Call-Letter — Contacts

Jurisdiction	Agency Contacted	Number of Contacts
Alberta	Department of Justice	4
British Columbia	Ministry of Attorney General	2
Canada	Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police (CACP)	1
	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS)	1
	Department of Justice	6
	National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC)	1
	Solicitor General	2
	Statistics Canada	1
Manitoba	Department of Justice	3
New Brunswick	Department of Justice	2
	Solicitor General	2
Newfoundland	Department of Justice	2
	Social Services	1
Northwest Territories	Department of Justice	2
	Justice Canada, Regional Office	1
Nova Scotia	Department of Justice	3
Ontario	Ministry of Attorney General	4
	Solicitor General & Correctional Services	2
	Community & Social Services	1
Prince Edward Island	Provincial Affairs & Attorney General	1
	Department of Justice & Attorney General	1
Québec	Department of Justice	3
	Public Security	3
Saskatchewan	Department of Justice	1
	Social Services	1
Yukon	Department of Justice	2
n = 13	**n = 26**	**n = 63**

2.1 Types of Responses

Since there was some overlap between the integrated and multidisciplinary justice call letters and since the two Groups were subsequently merged, responses to the multidisciplinary justice call-letter came in many forms. Some responded by answering the mulitdisciplinary justice call letter in the manner requested and submitted answers to the questionnaire. Some responded to the multidisciplinary justice call letter and submitted projects, but did not answer the questionnaire. In other cases, jurisdictions re-submitted their response to the integrated justice call-letter, including answers to the integrated justice questionnaire rather than the multidisciplinary justice questionnaire. In yet other instances, jurisdictions opted to re-affirm previously identified multidisciplinary justice projects.

In the last instance, the multidisciplinary justice call letter included an attachment, which listed previously identified multidisciplinary justice projects. The previous list was prepared by the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group on a Framework for Multidisciplinary Approach to Justice Issues, and provided to Deputy Ministers Responsible for Justice in 1995. The report to Deputies included a compilation of multidisciplinary justice projects (see Appendix C for materials relating to the previous multidisciplinary justice projects). These projects, however, did not include information on best practices and lessons learned nor did they include reference to possible evaluations.

2.2 Responses: The Numbers

From all respondents, a total of 72 projects were submitted in response to the multidisciplinary justice call-letter, and three contacts did not respond.

As shown in Table 2, twenty-four (31%) of the submitted projects included answers to the multidisciplinary justice questionnaire. Otherwise, forty-eight (65%) submitted projects did not include specific answers to the multidisciplinary justice questionnaire. Of these forty-eight projects, a total of twenty (27%) responded to the multidisciplinary justice call-letter but did not answer the questionnaire and therefore did not provide information on best practices and lessons learned nor on the issue of further evaluation. A further fourteen (19%) of the projects were merely re-affirmed from the previously prepared list — the previous work did not ask about best practices or lessons learned nor about evaluations and these projects, therefore, did not provide these kinds of information. In a further fourteen (19%) cases, the respondent re-submitted the integrated justice response as a multidisciplinary justice project — the integrated justice call-letter included a question about best practices and lessons learned but not all of the re-submitted integrated justice projects had answered this question; as well, the integrated justice call letter did not ask about possible evaluations so this kind of information was not provided for these projects (Appendix D provides a breakdown of types of responses by jurisdiction and project).

From the forty-four projects that answered the multidisciplinary justice call-letter either with or without answering the questionnaire, twenty-six provided information on best practices and lessons learned. Three of these indicated that it was "too early" to tell what were the best practices and/or lessons learned from these projects. The remaining twenty-three provided information on best practices, but only eight indicated any lessons learned. Of the fourteen re-submitted integrated justice projects, nine provided information on best practices, but none

provided information on lessons learned (Appendix E for information on which projects submitted best practices and lessons learned information).

Table 2: Responses — by Type

Type of Response	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Answered Multidisciplinary Justice Letter & Questionnaire	24	31%
Answered Multidisciplinary Letter, but not Questionnaire	20	27%
Re-submitted Answers to Integrated Justice Call-Letter	14	19%
Re-Affirmed Previously Identified Multidisciplinary Justice Projects	14	19%
Did Not Respond	3	4%
totals:	**72** (75-3)	**100%**

In summary, the samples with which this report will look at the issue of best practices and lessons learned as well as related matters is represented in Table 3 (below). There were, overall, thirty-two projects, which provided best practices information, eight, which provided responses on lessons learned, and fourteen, which were submitted for possible evaluation.

Table 3: Working Sample Size

	Total Sample	Multidisciplinary Justice Projects	Integrated Justice Projects
Projects	72	58	14
Best Practices	35	23 (26-3)[1]	9
Lessons Learned	8	8	0
Evaluations	14	14	n/a[2]

[1] three responses noted it was "too early" to tell what were the best practices or lessons learned.
[2] the Integrated Justice questionnaire did not ask about possible evaluations.

3. ANALYSIS

This section provides an analysis of the submissions received in response to the multidisciplinary justice call letter on best practices and lessons learned. As noted above, the initial focus has changed somewhat from an interest in particularly helpful practices in developing multidisciplinary justice projects to an interest in examining projects.

3.1 Best Practices & Lessons Learned

In analyzing the verbatim responses to the best practices and lessons learned question (see Appendix F for the verbatim responses), it becomes apparent that the majority of the responses speak to necessary aspects of undertaking multidisciplinary approaches rather than particularly successful or efficient practices in developing effective multidisciplinary justice projects.

Factors such as 'undertaking consultations,' for instance, or 'involving partnerships' were listed as best practices for a number of projects. These kinds of activities are necessary elements to developing multidisciplinary teams and multidisciplinary approaches, as opposed to particular approaches or practices that lead to effective multidisciplinary justice projects. As such, it appears that respondents understood the question in terms of providing successful projects as best practices rather than delineating particular practices, which lead to success. Nevertheless, a few projects did provide some insights into best practices and lessons learned.

3.1.1 Early Consultations

Consultation, obviously, is an element of any multidisciplinary justice project. A few respondents stressed the fact that consultation, to be successful and to assist in the development of successful multidisciplinary justice projects, needs to be undertaken early in the process and needs to genuinely engage partners.

In the words of some respondents:

> *The consultation process at the very beginning of the concept included the Judiciary, the Family Law Subsection, Courts administration and Planning and Research. Having all these parties involved at the outset facilitated a more co-operative and comprehensive approach to the overall development and implementation* [of the project] — Manitoba: Queen's bench (family division) Case Management Project.

> *As in other projects that have been developed with the Courts, early consultation with all parties affected by change is paramount. The opportunity to be a stakeholder in projects that are designed to improve the justice system offers persons more of an incentive to ensure that the project is a success — Manitoba: Custody Coordination Project.*

> *Police and Crown attorneys must be involved from the beginning. Police must know the staff and students and must have confidence in the project if*

they are to see it as a way to keep young people out of the justice system — Ontario: Peer Mediation Project.

This project emphasized the necessity of having in-depth consultation with the various stakeholders — Saskatchewan: The Family and Youth Plan Project.

In effect, early consultation with all implicated partners is an important and effective practice in the development of successful multidisciplinary justice projects.

3.1.2 Partnerships & Credible Agencies

Developing open, trusting relationships with partners, and being connected with credible agencies were also reported as essential elements of developing successful multidisciplinary justice projects.

Through the process of establishing a partnership relationship, it was learned that inclusive membership, listening to others, decision making by consensus, trust building, and developing guidelines are essential to forming a partnership — Saskatchewan: Provincial Partnership Committee on Family Violence Project.

The success of the CHCH Program is based on a variety of factors, including the successful integration of traditional and contemporary treatment methods; utilizing local resource persons and a team approach to intervention with victims, victimizers and all those affected by sexual abuse; establishing strong partnerships with justice and social service agencies; and, implementing an intervention model which is sensitive to the complex dynamics of sexual abuse ... the model demonstrates the importance of working with the community, justice and social service systems to address this complex problem — Manitoba: Hollow Water Community Holistic Circle Healing Project.

The project demonstrated that a contact person to link, motivate and help organize the community volunteers was necessary both to get the programs started and to keep them running. The need for the program to be flexible to meet the demands of each community was also a critical factor in the program's success — New Brunswick: Public Awareness on Family Violence through Community Partnerships Project.

For multidisciplinary approaches to justice problems, partnerships involving the community must strive to actively engage the community and thereby invest in the community some ownership in the outcome of the project. Successful projects, it appears, successfully empower the community to assume responsibility for the project's success.

As well, it seems that partners need assurance that other partners involved in the project

(directly or indirectly as service providers) must be credible. This was offered as a best practice for a victim services project:

> *Victims are referred to a credible agency that gives information and support to individuals in a state of crisis* — CACP: Victim Services (Waterloo Regional Police) Project.

As developed above, one element of successful community involvement is early consultations. Other factors are apparently also important. To summarize these in a word suggests that partnerships must be genuine. Genuine partnerships, it seems, require inclusive membership; a true willingness to listening to others; decision making by consensus; an emphasis on building trust; and, developing agreed upon guidelines and processes. Further, where there are a number of partners, it is important to establish and maintain a contact person to link, motivate and help organize the community, and there's a need for any program to meet the demands of each community involved.

3.1.3 Engaging Communities & Following Protocol

As one respondent stated:

> *In this type of project, the most important element is local involvement, and following proper protocol* — British Columbia: First Nations Journeys of Justice Project.

While not expressly stated, the writer is suggesting that organizations seeking cooperation and coordination in developing projects must ensure that they are sensitive to the needs and desires of the agencies with which they seek to cooperate, and that they follow accepted procedures in seeking approval and gaining agreement. In this respect, one must follow protocol especially in instances where there exists long standing traditions such as in Aboriginal or First Nations communities and/or where there exists some distrust of the justice system on the part of the group or community in question:

> *The lesson learned had to do with not following proper protocol in some cases ... one must know the proper channels to go through to get permission to conduct projects in First Nations communities* — British Columbia: First Nations Journeys of Justice Project.

Further experiences along these lines were also expressed in other projects:

> *These are communities where mistrust of service providers, educators and most professionals is quite high. Under these circumstances, there needs to be a minimum of 50% parents or community residents on every committee or subcommittee in this type of project, to obtain the level of comfort required for meaningful, significant participation of the community members* — Ontario: Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project.

Thus, following protocol speaks to the need to effectively engage communities in a project by securing "buy-in" and respecting partner's needs, desires, and traditions. There are undoubtedly numerous ways to effectively engage communities in justice-related projects. A few comments were provided as successful means for effectively engaging communities in multidisciplinary justice projects, for example:

> *Service providers and educators musts involve parents and community members in the planning and implementation from the start of this type of initiative. If there are too few community members involved, or if they are brought into the decision-making process too late, the trust between professionals and community members will be very difficult* — Ontario: Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project.

> *Key principles leading to the success of justice committees including providing justice committees with a maximum of autonomy within the general policy and legal parameters established by Manitoba Justice; providing administrative and training support to committees through liaison probation officers assigned to each committee; diverse expertise and experiences are brought together on each committee; continuity of committee membership, as it is not uncommon to find members with 10-12 years experience; flexibility of the model to operate in rural, urban, and Aboriginal communities; the ability of committees to act quickly following a referral of a case; and, providing a structure to promote and channel community ownership and responsibility for responding to crime and crime prevention* — Manitoba: Manitoba Justice Committees.

In summary, the evidence suggests that engaging communities and partners depends, to some degree, upon a number of factors including involving a range of participants not just in the project but also in its initial planning and implementation. Bringing in partners early in the process helps develop ownership, which shows some trust and fosters continued ownership over the project. Providing clear guidelines as well as administrative and other supports to partners fosters real community engagement, as does ensuring flexibility to meet different community needs for projects that span communities. In effect, these kinds of actions promote community ownership and "buy-in" and will assist in developing community responsibility for the success of the project.

As one respondent noted, it is paramount that communities and partners be involved in addressing crime and justice-related problems:

> *The purpose of the strategy is to involve people in local communities directly in defining the problem, developing solutions, implementing and evaluating programs that increase safety and reduce fear... It recognizes that communities are the best place for action and people most affected by the problem, in partnership with local, provincial and federal governments and organizations, and should be part of the solution* — Prince Edward Island:

3.2 Outcomes & Benefits

Beyond the above noted insights concerning particularly useful practices to follow in developing multidisciplinary justice projects, respondents often provided information on outcomes and benefits to be received from projects, even though this kind of information sought through the questionnaire.

3.2.1 Community Development

While not always a stated objective of the projects submitted, a number of projects had a positive impact on community development:

> *The garden project created an increased sense of community for all involve, including police; ... increased awareness of a multicultural society; ... increased community interaction; ... increase in the sense of empowerment; ... increased safety and trust in the community* — CACP: Victory Hills Community Garden (Waterloo Regional Police) Project.

> *While it is too soon to assess the outcomes, process evaluation showed that the Project has been effectively implemented. Neighbourhoods that were formerly demoralized and cynical about the future of children are now proud of their accomplishments and optimistic about their ability to raise children* — Ontario: Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project.

> *The purpose of the project is to address the alienation of aboriginal people from the justice system, as exemplified by high crime rates (particularly crimes of violence) and the ineffectiveness of the justice system in addressing the social problems which are the root cause of violent crime. Most offenders are from small and remote aboriginal communities. Processing offenders through courts and correctional institutions has not worked to correct behaviours and offenders are too often returned to the community only to re-offend. The project is designed to encourage community ownership of the problems and responsibility for the search for solutions, by facilitating community participation in the justice system and community-based processes, especially diversion. The approach is largely based on the principles of restorative justice and community development* — Northwest Territory: Community Justice Project.

> *Starting from a community development perspective, the Community Wellness initiative aims at the prevention of social problems by strengthening the ability of communities to respond to problems at the community level in ways that the community defines as appropriate. The role of the territorial government changes from a lead role to a supportive role* — Northwest Territory: Community Wellness Project.

> *The project demonstrates the process of community development in the justice context from preplanning, planning development, implementation and evaluation stages. It has taken approximately 2 to 3 years to build this type of consensus through community action so that the organization now has the support to go forward and actually deliver justice alternative measures services... Best practices illustrated by the project are in terms of building Aboriginal community consensus and community development and justice issues, empowering the community and coordinating inter-agency and inter-governmental response to community needs. The project is unique in that it follows a cooperative model of organization rather than a profit corporate structure. This makes it much more open to the community-at-large to be members of the Coop. Overall it improves accountability of the Coop to its membership as well. The project also demonstrates the importance of being familiar with the dynamics of community organizations in change* — Saskatchewan: Regina Aboriginal Human Services Cooperative Project.

In summary, community-based projects often have an impact beyond any direct effect on a particular justice or justice-related problem. These community-based projects have an impact on the community generally, in the form of community development. An improved sense of community — increased community awareness; increased community interaction — leads to an increased sense of empowerment, increased safety and trust, and a general optimism about the community's ability to address problems. In turn, such optimism further encourages community ownership over problems and responsibility over solutions to problems. Essentially, effective community development translates specific projects into communities with increased resources for the prevention of social problems generally, rather than just the ability to address specific project-oriented problems.

3.2.2 Reduced Costs / Improved Efficiencies

Some of the submitted projects reported benefits (either intended or confirmed) in the areas of cost and/or efficiency.

In British Columbia, for instance, the Strategic Reforms of British Columbia's Justice System: Justice System Administration Project had objectives to *achieve efficiencies by consolidating existing court facilities and avoiding future capital cost;* [and] *apply new technology to improve access to, and the efficiency of, the administration of justice services.*

In Manitoba, the purpose of the Queen's Bench Case Management Project:

> *... is to reduce delay and to facilitate earlier resolutions in more cases. Reduction in the duration of an action decreases the time required by parties and their lawyers to manage the events within the case, with concurrent reduction in the cost of litigation to the parties. A reduction in parties' costs will, in turn, facilitate increased access by a broader range of citizens to the*

services provided by courts... Supervision of the action is intended to facilitate more and earlier resolutions, resulting in significant savings to the parties and to court administration. These savings are realized by reducing the number of expensive court services required (principally, trials with their heavy demand on judicial, administrative and client resources). In short, the goal of case management is to achieve earlier resolutions in more cases through effective and efficient court processes.

According to plan, the Manitoba Custody Coordination Project should lead to a *reduction in not only numbers of prisoners being escorted, but as well in the number of trips having to be made between locations by the Sheriff's Officers and thereby hopefully resulting in some cost savings.*

Ontario's Criminal Procedure Reform Project, wherein the requirement of a court appearance for remand purposes is eliminated, should *save costs and court time.*

In Québec, both the Supervision and Guidance in Open Custody Project and the Compensatory Work Program are a *cost-effective way to invest in justice reforms*, while the Audiovisual Hearings Project has reduced *travel and accommodation costs for lawyers and their clients, not to mention the time wasted in traveling.* Cost, efficiency and effectiveness were also a motivating factor in Quebec's Computerization of Criminal Procedure Project and the Automatic Collection of Support Project, as well as the Simplified Procedure by Way of Declaration in Certain Civil Proceedings Project:

The costs incurred by the parties in a civil case are often disproportionate to the amounts claimed and even more so to the amounts actually recovered. This factor is particularly marked in cases in which the amount claimed or the value of the object in dispute is relatively modest. Furthermore, the number of possible procedures and the cost thereof as well as the extent of current delays in the regular trial process are sometimes tantamount to a denial of justice for the litigant. The complexity and slowness of the judicial process mean that the possibility of obtaining a satisfactory judgment following lengthy proceedings that were designed for another time, and are now inadequate and inefficient, is illusory. The delays and costs accordingly create a serious problem in terms of access to justice and far too often discourage individuals who are neither wealthy nor eligible for legal aid from asserting their rights in law...

The Community Based Justice Project in the Northwest Territories will also likely result in reduced costs: *community based justice process aspires to reduce processing costs to allow greater emphasis on healing individuals, families and the community.*

In effect, a large number and wide range of the submitted multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects aim to reduce costs and improve efficiencies in the justice system. Thus, working toward more integration across justice agencies and a more coordinated justice system response by adopting multidisciplinary approaches in partnership with other systems

as well as communities promotes and contributes to more cost effective and efficient means for carrying out the business of justice.

3.2.3 Reduced Crime / Victimization

A number of the submitted projects reported outcomes and benefits relating to crime prevention, reduced crime and fear of crime, and reduced victimization.

Two examples of projects which listed reduced crime as an objective are: Strategic Reforms of British Columbia's Justice System: Criminal Justice, and Saskatchewan's Action Plan for Children.

Some projects aimed to reduce particular types of crime. The Fast Water, Fast Friends (CACP — Waterloo Regional Police) Project, for example, aimed to promote mutual respect between cultures, towards the elimination of hate crimes, discrimination and bias against minorities and youth.

As well, a wide range of projects were designed, in whole or in part, to prevent crime, including:

- Victory Hills Community Garden — Waterloo Regional Police.
- Values, Influences & Peers — Waterloo Regional Police.
- Vision 2000 Police / Youth Mentoring Program — Waterloo Regional Police.
- Youth Justice Education Partnership — Department of Justice.
- Manitoba Justice Committees.
- Mediation Services — Manitoba.
- Community Justice — Northwest Territories.
- Inter-Ministerial Community Safety and Crime Prevention Project Team — Ontario.
- Vision — Justice into the 21st Century — Prince Edward Island.
- Long-Term Provincial Crime Prevention and Community Safety Strategy — Prince Edward Island.
- Community Based Justice — Yukon.
- Community-Based Approach to Crime Prevention — Yukon.

Some projects specifically aimed to reduce the fear of crime. Prince Edward Island's Long-Term Provincial Crime Prevention and Community Safety Strategy Project, for example, works toward the development of safer communities in Prince Edward Island, *and the elimination of fear of victimization.*

Beyond stated objectives, there is evidence that multidisciplinary justice projects deliver on crime reduction and crime prevention:

> *The garden project created an increased sense of community for all involved, including police. Over 100 families now participate. Two specific apartment buildings overlooking the garden showed a decrease from 119 occurrences that police responded to in 1993 to 84 occurrences in 1994 — a 30%*

decrease for the street as a whole. [The project also showed] *increased safety and trust in the community*, [and] *excellent use of crime prevention through environmental design principle, putting a safe activity into an unsafe area produces a reduction in crime* — CACP: Victory Hills Community Garden (Waterloo Regional Police).

Thus, multidisciplinary approaches to justice are often oriented toward and produce the benefits of community development, crime prevention and crime reduction as well as increased personal safety and decreased fear of crime.

3.3 Project Types, Characteristics & Targets

Above, the analysis looked at fairly straightforward elements of the project submissions, namely what particularly effective practices were reported and what kinds of beneficial outcomes resulted from the projects. The aim behind this section is to highlight some common traits across projects in order to further our understanding of multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects.

In reviewing the various projects, it appeared that there were some differences in type of project. The analysis looked at the kind of partnerships undertaken and resulted in a classification of four project orientations (see Appendix G for a summary of projects by partnership orientation):

- community partnerships;
- justice system coordination;
- inter-system cooperation; and,
- holistic approaches.

In one sense, given that submitted projects included both multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects, different kinds of partnership orientations emerged. Three of these orientations may be thought of as representing degrees or kinds of justice integration.

- Justice System Coordination are projects with an orientation toward internal integration where justice system agencies become more involved with other justice system agencies with the aim of integrating their work.

- Community Partnership projects represent an initial step in external integration wherein justice agencies partner with affected and interested communities to address a justice problem.

- Inter-System Cooperation Projects, which seek to improve cooperation between the justice system or agencies of the justice system and other public systems (e.g., education), represent a different, perhaps more complex, kind of external integration.

Finally, there is the fourth category dubbed holistic approaches. These projects may include elements of community partnerships, justice system and/or inter-system cooperation. They may also have unusual partners such as a very specific community group or may have very a very specific target group. As such, these projects are more difficult to classify; however, these

projects have adopted an orientation toward developing complete and holistic responses to problems rather than adopting an orientation around a particular kind of partnership.

3.3.1 Community Partnership Projects

Of the projects which provided information on best practices and lessons learned, eight fall within the category of community partnership projects (see again Appendix G). Community partnership projects refer to projects where the justice system or an element of the justice system cooperated with a community in addressing a justice problem or in developing a justice-related project. Classification as a community partnership project doesn't preclude the project from having other, non-community partners; rather, the community partnership classification has been used for those projects where the primary partner seems to be the community.

Respondents used a number of factors to describe these projects, all of which relate to developing justice system and community partnerships. These characteristics include:

- flexibility to adapt to community needs;
- community ownership;
- community responsibility;
- community empowerment;
- community solutions;
- community partnerships;
- community volunteers; and,
- community development;

It is quite clear from these characteristics that the focus of these kinds of projects is to build community strength in dealing with justice and justice-related problems in partnership with justice agencies, and to help develop community ownership over and community ability to deal with justice-related problems.

These community partnership projects tended to have similar project targets. Targets, in this sense, have two connotations. First, there is a legal or justice target such as victim's services or crime prevention. Second, there is a social or community target such as certain types of crime victims or a certain groups of people within the community.

The legal and justice targets of these community partnership projects included:

- victim services;
- family violence;
- crime prevention;
- police-community relations;
- diversion;
- mediation; and,
- restorative justice.

The social targets of these community partnership projects included:

- victims;
- youth;
- racial / ethnic minorities; and,
- First Nations / aboriginal communities.

The kinds of outcomes associated with these community partnership projects include:

- increased awareness of multicultural society and understanding of cross-cultural and anti-racism issues;
- more culturally appropriate response to crime;
- increased community interaction and community relations;
- increased safety and trust in the community;
- increased community ownership over justice problems and projects;
- increased diversion of less serious offenders, freeing up courts to deal with more serious offenders;
- a more focused justice system; and,
- prevention of social problems by strengthening the ability of communities to respond to problems.

In effect, community partnership projects — which may be looked upon as a first level or degree of external integration — have a number of commonalities and benefits. On one hand, these kinds of projects tend to be oriented toward matters such as preventing crime, assisting victims and helping those groups in society that historically have not enjoyed full access to justice and justice related services (e.g., aboriginal and First Nations peoples; racial and ethnic minorities). As well, these kinds of projects are associated with similar kinds of outcomes along two lines: developing communities and community ownership over justice-related issues; and, developing a more focused use of the justice system.

3.3.2 Justice System Coordination

Of the projects submitted as best practices and lessons learned, twelve were classified as justice system coordination projects (see again Appendix G). Justice system coordination is used to identify projects which brought together different agencies within the justice system to work cooperatively on a project — these projects may therefore be looked upon as oriented to internal integration. As noted above, justice system coordination projects are not necessarily limited to partnerships within the justice system. These projects may have had other partners, but the justice system coordination classification was used since the primary partnership appeared to be within the justice system.

The legal and justice targets of these community partnership projects included:

- family violence;
- youth and youth violence;
- improved security / reduced cost (re: transporting accused and offenders);

- reintegration of offenders;
- regionalization & integration of services (re: corrections);
- reduced institutionalization (re: non-payment of fines);
- administration of justice (re: criminal justice);
- crime prevention;
- community safety (re: community notification upon offender release);
- community justice (i.e., alternative measures);
- reduced contact with the justice system;
- mediation; and,
- restorative justice.

The social targets of these community partnership projects included:

- female victims (re: spousal abuse / sexual assault);
- offenders (re: spousal abuse / sexual assault);
- justice system staff (education/training re: family violence);
- Aboriginal communities / Aboriginal youth;
- family division court clients;
- youth / violent youth;
- communities (re: release of high-risk offenders);
- the poor (re: non-payment of fines); and,
- victims / witnesses of violence (i.e., women, children, racial minorities, gays & lesbians, vulnerable adults).

The kinds of outcomes associated with these community partnership projects include:

- more focused / appropriate use of resources;
- efficient / effective solutions to justice problems;
- reduced costs (litigants and general public);
- reduced delays (re: litigation)
- increased satisfaction with court process (i.e., for litigants, lawyers, Judges);
- reduced security risks (re: transport offenders / accused);
- more efficient access to justice services;
- diversion of cases & more free court time for serious cases; and,
- reduced rates of imprisonment (re: non-payment of fines).

Justice system coordination projects — which may be viewed as oriented toward internal integration — seem to have a mixed range of targets, and similarities in objectives or outcomes. The legal and justice targets range from an orientation toward violence, to one of community development, to another of reduced use of the traditional justice system through reduced institutionalization, mediation and restitution. The social targets are similarly mixed, ranging from victims and offenders to justice system staff, to some less-advantaged social groups such as Aboriginal communities and the poor. A number of these projects, however, have a similar objective, namely to make the justice system more efficient and cost effective and to reduce administrative strain through matters such as reduced delays and reduced imprisonment.

3.3.3 Inter-System Cooperation

Eleven of the projects submitted as best practices and lessons learned were classified as inter-system cooperation projects (see again Appendix G). Inter-system cooperation identifies projects that involve the cooperation of the justice system or an agency of the justice system and other public systems such as the education system — these projects may therefore be looked upon as oriented to external integration, but they differ from community partnership projects where the justice system cooperates with communities as opposed to other publicly managed and operated systems. However, as with all the project designations used herein, inter-system cooperation projects are not necessarily limited to partnerships with agencies from other public service systems. These projects may involve elements of community partnership and/or justice system coordination, but the inter-system cooperation designation is used since the primary orientation appears to be toward integrating with other publicly run service systems.

The legal and justice targets of these community partnership projects included:

- family violence;
- community development;
- crime prevention;
- reduced contact with the justice system;
- mediation; and,
- restorative justice.

The social targets of these community partnership projects included:

- children and youth;
- families and communities generally;
- the poor;
- First Nations communities;
- Aboriginal communities;
- targets and witnesses of violence, including women, children, racial minorities, gays and lesbians, and vulnerable adults; and,
- at-risk future abusers (e.g., spousal abuse).

The kinds of outcomes associated with these community partnership projects include:

- community empowerment;
- increased community capacity to address needs of offenders and victims;
- improved community awareness of violence against women;
- increased collaboration among community agencies and between government and the community;
- reduced violence through prevention, education and early intervention;
- reduced offending behaviour among youth;
- decreased likelihood that child witnesses to violence will become perpetrators or victims

of violence;
- reduced impact on child witness to woman abuse;
- reduced probability of poor health, poor social behaviour and poor school performance among youth;
- reduced violence against women;
- reduced need for expensive remedial programs such as welfare, mental health, special education and corrections;
- reduced reliance on traditional justice system;
- increased use of alternative measures;
- reduced use of custody and private treatment referrals; and,
- improved access to justice for victims of violence.

Overall, inter-system cooperation projects appear to have a comparatively narrow range of legal and justice targets, apparently focused on violence issues, community development and reduced use of the traditional justice system through avenues such as mediation, alternative measures and restorative justice. As well, the social targets of these kinds of projects also seem relatively narrow, being focused on disadvantaged groups such as the poor, Aboriginal people, First Nations people and racial minorities. The kinds of benefits to accrue from these projects, however, are numerous and span a range of justice-system objectives including community development and empowerment; reduced violence and reduced offending; reduced impact on victims and witnesses of crime; reduced use of the traditional justice system and related, costly referral services and increased use of community capacities to address problems; increased collaboration with communities, social agencies and governments in addressing crime; and, improved access to justice for crime victims.

3.3.4 Holistic Approaches

Three of the projects submitted as best practices and lessons learned were classified as holistic approaches projects (see again Appendix G). These three projects could have been classified within the other three classifications used above; however, they were classified in this fashion because they all, in one manner or another, used language to suggest that one of the central aims was to develop an overall, or holistic approach, to a particular problem.

The Mentally Disordered Offenders Protocol — Sexual Assaults Project in British Columbia is one of these projects and the language used suggests that one of the main orientations of the project is to develop a holistic approach:

> *This project is designed to reduce the number of times that mentally disordered offenders in conflict with the law come into contact with the justice system by encouraging various service providers to cooperate in order to assist the subject in better managing his or her life. Participants are encouraged to cooperate with this initiative. In the past, participants with limited budgets have sometimes looked for reasons to suggest that other service providers have primary responsibility, thereby avoiding effort and*

expense on their own part... [A best practice involves] *encouraging the partners in this project to think cooperatively and to deal with all aspects of the subject's situation.*

In Manitoba, the Hollow Water Community Holistic Healing Project, as the name suggests, also takes an holistic approach:

The CHCH program is designed to provide a comprehensive response to sexual abuse in the Manitoba communities of Hollow Water First Nation, and the Métis communities of Aghaming, Seymourville and Manigotagen. The program consists of seven (7) local workers who have been trained in sexual abuse intervention who provide pre-, peri- and post-court intervention for those cases which proceed through the criminal courts, as well as assistance to victims and victimizers whose cases do not proceed to court... The success of the CHCH Program is based on a variety of factors, including the successful integration of traditional and contemporary treatment methods; utilizing local resource persons and a team approach to intervention with victims, victimizers and all those affected by sexual abuse; establishing a strong partnership with justice and social service agencies; and, implementing an intervention model which is sensitive to the complex dynamics of sexual abuse... The final intervention model reflects a belief in the power of integrating traditional and contemporary treatment models. Furthermore, the model demonstrates the importance and success of working with the community, justice and social service systems to address this complex problem.

In the Yukon, the Community Based Justice Project, a complex project involving many components and a number of partners, is also holistically oriented. The specific objectives of the project may be summarized as aiming to minimize people's contact with the traditional justice system by utilizing and developing restorative justice. Restorative justice may or may not be viewed as being holistic in itself; however, in the Yukon project it seems oriented toward holistic responses to justice problems in the sense that *the project affects the community as a whole.*

It is much more difficult to attempt, as above, to categorize targets and outcomes of projects, which attempt holistic approaches to justice problems. In part this is due to the fact that there are only three projects and the projects do not necessarily have much in common other than the holistic nature of the approach.

However, there appears to be one commonality worth noting across these projects: they share the similar outcome objective or orientation of reducing people's contact with the traditional justice system. In the case of the B.C. project the social target is mentally disordered offenders. In the Manitoba and Yukon projects, the social target is the First Nations and Aboriginal communities.

3.3.5 Comparing Integrated & Multidisciplinary Projects

As noted, both multidisciplinary justice projects and integrated justice projects were submitted for this report and both kinds of projects were included in the sample of projects analyzed above. As a result, there may be differences between the two kinds of projects and the partnership orientations that they take.

In total, there were thirty-five projects submitted with best practices and lessons learned information (see again Table 3, & and Appendix E). Of these thirty-five projects, twenty-six were multidisciplinary justice projects and nine were integrated justice projects. Table 4 provides a breakdown of the projects by partnership orientation.

Table 4: Partnership Orientation by Project Type

Partnership Orientation	Multidisciplinary Justice Projects	Integrated Justice Projects	Totals:
Community Partnership	8	0	8
Justice System Coordination	5	8	13
Inter-System Cooperation	11	0	11
Holistic Approaches	2	1	3
Totals:	26	9	35

Based on the limited sample of projects submitted, it is evident that there are differences in orientation between multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects. This analysis must be considered preliminary and exploratory since the sample is admittedly small and selected. However, none of the integrated justice projects were classified as having either a community partnership or an inter-system cooperation orientation. Integrated justice projects are primarily oriented toward justice system coordination — using the language developed above, integrated justice projects are oriented toward internal integration. On the other hand, multidisciplinary justice projects are more varied in orientation. In comparison to integrated justice projects, multidisciplinary justice projects seem to be much more adaptable to different kinds of partnerships and much more oriented toward external integration.

Looking at the kinds of targets and outcomes for these different kinds of projects shows other differences between multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects, as well as some similarities. Table 5 provides an overview of the kinds of targets and outcomes associated with each of three project orientations — community partnership projects; justice system coordination projects; and, inter-system cooperation projects. Table 5 was created using the overview summaries provided above for each of these three project types and is therefore exploratory in nature.

Table 5: Targets & Outcomes — by Partnership Orientation

Project Orientation	Legal / Justice Targets	Social Targets	Outcomes
Community Partnership	crime prevention; community development.	assisting victims; helping disadvantaged groups.	community development & community ownership; more focused use of justice system.
Justice System Coordination	violence; community development; reduced use of traditional justice system.	victims ; offenders; less advantaged social groups.	efficiency; cost effectiveness.
Inter-System Cooperation	violence issues; community development; reduced use of traditional justice system.	disadvantaged groups.	community development; reduced violence / reduced offending; improved access to justice; reduced costs.

Looking at Table 5, it is fairly straightforward to see that there is similarity across the three partnership orientations in terms of targets. All three classifications share similar legal/justice targets such as community development and crime prevention; as well, all three have similar social targets of assisting historically disadvantaged groups.

In terms of outcomes, there appears to be similarities and differences. The two orientations that are most associated with multidisciplinary justice projects (i.e., community partnerships and inter-system cooperation) are associated with community-oriented outcomes such as community development and reduced violence and reduced offending. The third orientation (i.e., justice system coordination) is associated only with efficiency and effectiveness outcomes.

These findings, albeit preliminary and exploratory, offer support to the idea that, comparatively, multidisciplinary justice projects (i.e., those oriented toward community partnership and inter-system cooperation) are more oriented toward external integration, and integrated justice projects (i.e., justice system coordination) are more oriented toward internal integration. This leads to the possibility that multidisciplinary approaches are more appropriate for projects, which seek external impacts, and integrated justice projects are more suitable for projects seeking internal justice system impacts.

Nevertheless, Table 5 also shows that there are similarities in outcomes across the three project types. All three seem to lead to the benefits of a more focused use of the justice

system, and some form of reduced costs or improved efficiencies. As such, while there appears to be differences in external versus internal impacts, all three project types, and therefore both multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects, hold promise in achieving efficiency and effectiveness outcomes.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This section aims to summarize and go beyond the foregoing analysis and further explore multidisciplinary and integrated justice.

4.1. Best Practices

Three related elements of best practices (i.e., processes that assist in developing successful multidisciplinary justice projects, as opposed to exemplary projects *per se*) were discussed and developed.

It is apparent that using early consultations plays an important role in effectively engaging partners and developing meaningful partnerships where all parties involved assume a degree of ownership over a project and responsibility for a project's success. In a related manner, partnerships must be genuine in order to be successful. Obviously, early consultations will impact a community's likelihood of accepting an invitation to participate in a multidisciplinary or integrated justice project, and such early consultations will likely be viewed as a genuine invitation to participate and a genuine desire on the part of the justice system to undertake a partnership to address the issue or problem at hand. Beyond this, genuine partnerships require inclusive membership, a real openness between justice system agencies and actors and their partners, decision-making by consensus, an emphasis on building trust between and across all partners, and developing and following agreed upon guidelines and processes throughout the project.

4.2 Outcomes & Benefits

Beyond these best practices, there are associated and identifiable outcomes and benefits to accrue from the submitted exemplary multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects. Three kinds of benefits and outcomes emerged from an analysis of the reported benefits from the submitted projects.

Community-based justice projects, where the justice system teams with communities to address particularly issues or problems, often have an impact beyond any direct effect on a particular justice or justice-related problem. These kinds of projects have an impact on the community generally, in the form of community development. Community development may be seen as comprising an improved sense of community, an increased community awareness, and increased community interaction. These kinds of tangible improvements in the community may lead to an increased community empowerment, increased safety and trust, and a general optimism about the community's ability to address problems. Optimism, it seems, further encourages community ownership over problems and responsibility over solutions to problems, and the prevention of social problems.

A number of multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects reported objectives or results of reduced costs and improved efficiencies. It seems that efforts aimed at integration, coordination, and cooperation between justice agencies and with other agencies and community groups promotes and contributes to innovative means for addressing justice and justice-related problems which often

result, either directly or indirectly, in a more effective and efficient responses to problems and issues faced by the justice system.

Multidisciplinary approaches to justice, as well as integrated justice projects, are often oriented toward community development and, as noted, improved community development often leads to results such as crime prevention and crime reduction as well as increased personal safety, decreased fear of crime, reduced crime and reduced victimization.

4.3 Classifying & Analyzing Projects Partnership Orientation

As the analysis on best practices and benefits was being undertaken, it became clear that there were differences in partnership orientation that seemed to be important in looking at possible relationships between such orientation and benefits and outcomes.

4.3.1 Different Partnership Orientations

Based on the apparent primary partner, it was possible to develop a classification system as follows.

1. Community Partnership projects represent an initial step in external integration wherein justice agencies partner with affected and interested communities to address a justice problem.

2. Justice System Coordination projects have an orientation toward internal integration where justice system agencies become more involved with other justice system agencies with the aim of integrating their work.

3. Inter-System Cooperation projects, which seek to improve cooperation between the justice system or agencies of the justice system and other public systems (e.g., education), represent a different, perhaps more complex, kind of external integration.

4. Holistic approaches may include elements of community partnerships, justice system and/or inter-system cooperation. They may also have unusual partners such as a very specific community group or may have a very specific target group. However these projects share a commonality: they have adopted an orientation toward developing complete and holistic responses to problems rather than adopting an orientation around a particular kind of partnership.

4.3.2 Internal & External Integration

Looking at the projects within this classification, it is apparent that multidisciplinary projects and integrated projects have different orientations. Multidisciplinary justice projects are more likely to be oriented toward community partnerships and inter-system cooperation than are integrated justice projects. Integrated justice projects are almost exclusively oriented toward justice system coordination partnerships, with no integrated

justice projects falling within either the community partnership or inter-system cooperation categories.

While these findings must be considered preliminary and exploratory, analysis suggests that:

- Integrated justice projects appear to be primarily concerned with internal integration — that is, integrated justice projects appear to be focused on developing linkages within and across the justice system itself.

  This preliminary finding is somewhat in contrast to the scope of the working definition of integrated justice (see again Figures 1 & 2), which identifies integrated justice as an approach to dealing with justice-related problems as oriented toward both internal and external integration.

- Multidisciplinary justice projects, on the other hand, seem to be much more adaptable to different kinds of partnerships and concerned with external integration — that is, multidisciplinary justice projects appear to be primarily concerned with developing linkages and partners outside of the traditional justice system by working with communities, community groups, service agencies and other public systems (e.g., education).

  In terms of the working definition, that part of the definition which speaks of *meshing the justice system with other ways of dealing with problems (other disciplines)* closely resembles a traditional understanding of a multidisciplinary approach, including the projects submitted for this report in that multidisciplinary projects were often oriented toward external integration.

4.3.3 Targets & Benefits:

Continuing from an analysis of internal versus external orientation, it was possible to look at differences between multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects in terms of the project targets and the benefits to accrue from each.

In terms of the partnership orientations, there were clear similarities in terms of targets for all three partnership orientations — community partnership, justice system coordination, inter-system cooperation. All had similar legal/justice targets such as community development and crime prevention; and, all had similar social targets of assisting historically disadvantaged groups. In effect, both multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects had similar justice-system objectives as well as similar social-community objectives.

Similarly, the analysis revealed that there are similarities in outcomes across the three types of partnership orientations. As such, it appears that both multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects may lead to the benefits of a more focused use of the justice system, and some form of reduced costs or improved efficiencies.

As such, while there appears to be differences in external versus internal orientation, all three project types, and therefore both multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects, have similar targets and objectives and both hold promise in achieving similar goals, including efficiency and effectiveness.

4.4 Thinking about Integrated Justice

One of the recurring themes in research, and one of the simple truths about exploratory research, is that results tend to lead more toward further questions than to definitive answers. The present project on 'best practices and lessons learned' is no exception. The project was initiated as an exploratory project aiming to better delineate those particular practices, which lead to successful multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects. The submissions only rarely provided insights into particularly useful practices. The majority of submissions represented successful projects rather than insights into practices leading to success. One project in particular, however, nicely asks some of the kinds of questions, which arise from this research project.

4.4.1 Toward Integrated Justice Policy Development & Decision-Making

The Provincial Partnership Committee on Family Violence Project (Saskatchewan) provides some interesting insight on both what is meant by integrated justice and on further research and information needs. As the submission states:

> *At inception in 1992, the purpose of the project was to determine if partnerships could be established between government Departments, the federal government and community. Prior to the project, the issue of violence in the family in Saskatchewan was dealt with in isolation, with sporadic attempts at consultation and programs and services being developed randomly and inconsistently.*

Thus, it is easy to see that this project is not simply an attempt to develop a multidisciplinary approach to a justice problem. Inherent in the purpose of the project was an objective of integration — integration across governments and with communities. The degree to which integration has been attempted is made clear by the number and range of institutions involved:

> *The Inter-Departmental Committee on Family Violence is co-chaired by Justice and Women's Secretariat and is made up of representatives from Social Services, Health, Education, Indian and Métis Affairs Secretariat, Agriculture and Food, Finance, and Housing Division, Municipal Government. This committee shares information regarding programs, services, policy development and budgets across government.*

Within the project submission, there are some interesting insights on what kinds of information are required to better understand integrated justice and how integrated justice projects may be successfully implemented:

Through the process of establishing a partnership relationship, it was learned that inclusive membership, listening to others, decision making by consensus, trust building, and developing guidelines are essential ingredients to forming a partnership... [However] *...there were several barriers to working in a partnership that could have undermined or defeated the partnership process, including:*

- *costs to pull people together;*
- *determining who should represent the government;*
- *determining for whom government representatives spoke (the Department?, themselves?);*
- *addressing people's special needs (e.g., child-care, disability access, honorariums, etc.);*
- *defining a workable meaning for "inclusivity";*
- *developing a non-hierarchical structure;*
- *establishing a decision making process and criterion;*
- *defining partnership criteria; and,*
- *ensuring accountability for all members / partners.*

If one thinks about what integrated justice means — leaving aside any formal definition for the moment — there are a number of ways one could view integrated justice. For example, one could see any attempt to work with non-justice system partners in a multidisciplinary fashion as integrated justice, at least to a degree. However, simple or strictly multidisciplinary partnerships fall short of a more complete view of integrated justice. A more complete or comprehensive view of integrated justice would not only involve multidisciplinary partnerships, but would also look beyond project or problem oriented attempts to integrate work and look toward the integration of policy development and decision-making across all agencies involved in social policy issues.

The idea that integrated justice is a process of developing integrated policy development — integrated with community desires and community needs, and integrated with other public service systems such as health, education, social services, *et cetera* — raises the kinds of questions noted above.

- *it is problematic to determine who should represent the government, for whom government representatives spoke (the Department?, themselves?), and ensuring accountability for all members / partners.*

  If the desire is to develop mechanisms by which integrated justice can develop, there must be some sort of established or accepted determinations of role and of representation;

- *there are difficulties surrounding defining a workable meaning for "inclusivity" and, defining partnership criteria.*

It is not enough to bring people together with good intentions of developing integrated policies, it is necessary to create parameters for inclusion in this kind of decision-making process and ensuring that there is agreement both on who does and does not get included; and,

> *there are problems in developing a non-hierarchical structure, and establishing a decision making process and criterion.*

Implicit in the idea that policy making may be addressed through integrated decision-making is the idea that there is some level of equality of importance across involved institutions such that, for example, the justice issues do not necessarily take precedence over the health issues in any one particular social policy area. As such, a non-hierarchical structure is an important element in developing structures, which promote integrated policy development and integrated decision-making process.

This kind of comprehensive integrated justice is therefore more of a process than a project or initiative. In theory at least, any public policy issue could be addressed using an integrated policy development and decision-making model and employ a multidisciplinary approach to program delivery. As the above noted questions suggest, there needs be more work done to better understand how to develop and overcome some of the barriers and problems in developing integrated decision-making mechanisms.

4.4.2 The Role of Multidisciplinary Approaches to Justice

Looking at integrated justice as a continuum where a higher degree of integration implies integrated policy development through integrated decision-making, as suggested above, leaves the question as to what the role of multidisciplinary approaches to justice is within integrated justice.

The findings of this project suggest that both multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects, as they are currently understood, address similar targets and aim at achieving similar objectives. The differences noted are primarily differences in the type of partnership orientation. On the one hand, the findings suggest that multidisciplinary justice projects are much more likely to partner with non-justice system agencies as compared with integrated justice projects. However, this difference is likely not some immutable limitation in the kinds of partners that can be engaged through integrated justice projects. These early attempts at integration may be primarily confined to internal integration as first steps in learning how to do more complex and comprehensive integrated justice policy development. As such, the kinds of best practices noted above — which were reported almost exclusively for multidisciplinary justice projects — offer insight into advancing and developing knowledge about, and projects in, integrated justice.

Further, if one looks at integrated justice as integrated policy development, it is true to some extent that the focus of integrated justice leans toward process. The kinds of problems and questions noted above reflect the fact that many of the issues are process issues. Multidisciplinary approaches to justice problems, while necessarily involving some process issues around developing partnerships, sharing responsibility and developing protocols, are more

oriented toward service delivery. The result, in effect, is that there appears to be a natural synergy between multidisciplinary and integrated justice. On one level, multidisciplinary justice provides some insights on the process of bringing together different players to develop projects. On another level, integrated justice implies multidisciplinary approaches to addressing social policy issues since the expertise of a number of players will be brought together to best address issues. On yet another level, if integrated justice is thought of as the process on developing integrated policy development, it just makes sense that multidisciplinary approaches are the way to deliver the agreed upon policies.

4.4.3 Assessing the Effect of Integrated & Multidisciplinary Justice

Looking at the overall benefits and impacts of multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects, it is possible to see these projects as all contributing to the advancement of access to justice. Access to justice has a long history and includes efforts such as legal aid, public legal education and information programs, as well as court-based efforts such as the native courtworker program. These kinds of efforts all represent attempts to provide individuals and historically disadvantaged groups with better and more equal access to justice and justice-related services.

Multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects also fall within the continuum of efforts to improve access to justice. However, there's a distinction to be made between multidisciplinary and integrated justice approaches and the previous programmatic approaches such as legal aid or native courtworker. Multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects are not programmatic approaches and the main objective is not to improve access to justice services. The objectives of multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects, beyond the specific project-determined objectives, are to improve access to the development of justice projects and to decision-making in the justice system.

As such, these kinds of projects are engaging citizens in the development of the justice system which is likely to impact a number of factors of interest to the justice system, including:

- people's respect for the law, the justice system and agencies of the justice system;
- citizen's awareness and understanding of the law and the justice system; and,
- people's willingness to participate in the justice system as witnesses and volunteers.

In this light, multidisciplinary and integrated justice projects have great potential for improving access to justice not just in traditional access to justice areas such as legal aid and courtworker problems, but also in other areas such as:

- restorative justice;
- alternative dispute resolution;
- crime prevention;
- community development; and, generally,
- social cohesion.

APPENDIX A

MULTIDISCIPLINARY JUSTICE CALL-LETTER – QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire concerning Multidisciplinary Justice projects,
attached to a letter (dated August 13, 1996) from the
Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group on Multidisciplinary Justice
to Justice officials in all jurisdictions

(NOT CURRENTLY AVAILABLE)

APPENDIX B

INTEGRATED JUSTICE CALL-LETTER – QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire concerning Integrated Justice projects,
attached to a letter (dated July 4, 1996) from
the Deputy Attorney General British Columbia
to Deputy Ministers Responsible for Justice from all jurisdictions.

(NOT CURRENTLY AVAILABLE)

APPENDIX C

PREVIOUS MULTIDISCIPLINARY JUSTICE WORKING GROUP MATERIALS

Contents:

1. Questionnaire asking for Multidisciplinary Justice Projects originally attached to a memorandum from the Department of Justice (dated November 15, 1994) to all jurisdictions.

2. Example of the List of Previous Projects (from the "Frameworks" Working Group report to Deputy Ministers, December 1995).[4]

(NOT CURRENTLY AVAILABLE)

[4] Ontario's projects are provided as an example. Ontario's input was selected as the example for no particular reason other than the fact that they include examples of all three types of projects requested: existing multidisciplinary projects; new initiatives which use a multidisciplinary approach; and, justice system efficiency initiatives.

APPENDIX D

RESPONSES — BY JURISDICTION & TYPE OF RESPONSE

Responses — BY JURISDICTION & TYPE OF RESPONSE

Jurisdiction	Respondent Agency / Department	Project[5]	Answered Questions	Answered Letter but not Questions	Affirmed Projects from previous list	Re-Submitted Integrated Justice Response	Did not Respond
Alberta	Justice	Alta-1	x				
	Justice	Alta-2			x		
	Justice	Alta-3			x		
	Justice	Alta-4			x		
	Justice	Alta-5			x		
	Justice	Alta-6			x		
	Justice	Alta-7			x		
B.C.	Attorney General	BC-1		x			
	Attorney General	BC-2	x				
	Attorney General	BC-3			x		
	Attorney General	BC-4			x		
	Attorney General	BC-5			x		
	Law Courts Education Society	BC-6	x				
CACP	Waterloo Regional Police	CACP-1	x				
	Waterloo Regional Police	CACP-2	x				
	Waterloo Regional Police	CACP-3	x				
	Waterloo Regional Police	CACP-4	x				
	Waterloo Regional Police	CACP-5	x				
Justice	Programs Directorate	Jus-1		x			
	Programs Directorate	Jus-2		x			
	Programs Directorate	Jus-3		x			
	Programs Directorate	Jus-4		x			

[5] The projects are identified here, and in other appendices, according to the code provided in the companion document, *Multidisciplinary Approaches to Justice: A Compilation of Projects*, also produced by the Research Sub-Group of the FPT Working Group on Integrated Justice.

Responses — BY JURISDICTION & TYPE OF RESPONSE (continued)

Jurisdiction	Respondent Agency / Department	Project	Answered Questions	Answered Letter but not Questions	Affirmed Projects from previous list	Re-Submitted Integrated Justice Response	Did not Respond
Manitoba	Justice	Man-1	x				
	Justice	Man-2	x				
	Justice	Man-3				x	
	Justice	Man-4				x	
	Justice	Man-5				x	
	Justice	Man-6				x	
	Justice	Man-7	x				
NCPC	Crime Prevention Council	NCPC-1		x			
N.B.	Justice	NB-1		x			
	Justice	NB-2		x			
	Justice	NB-3		x			
Nfld	Justice	Nfld-1	x				
	Justice	Nfld-2	x				
	Justice	Nfld-3		x			
	Justice	Nfld-4		x			
	Justice	Nfld-5		x			
	Justice	Nfld-6		x			
NWT	Justice	NWT-1	x				
	Justice	NWT-2	x				
N.S.	n/a						x
Ontario	Attorney General	Ont-1	x				
	Attorney General	Ont-2	x				
	Attorney General	Ont-3	x				
	Attorney General	Ont-4	x				
	Attorney General	Ont-5			x		
	Attorney General	Ont-6			x		
	Attorney General	Ont-7			x		
	Attorney General	Ont-8			x		
	Attorney General	Ont-9			x		

Responses — BY JURISDICTION & TYPE OF RESPONSE (continued)

Jurisdiction	Respondent Agency / Department	Project	Answered Questions	Answered Letter but not Questions	Affirmed Projects from previous list	Re-Submitted Integrated Justice Response	Did not Respond
P.E.I.	Corrections	PEI-1		x			
	Corrections	PEI-2		x			
	Corrections	PEI-3		x			
	Corrections	PEI-4		x			
Québec	Sécurité publique	PQ-1				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-2				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-3				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-4				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-5				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-6				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-7				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-8				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-9				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-10				x	
Saskatchewan	Justice	Sask-1	x				
	Justice	Sask-2	x				
	Social Services	Sask-3	x				
	Social Services	Sask-4		x			
Solicitor General	n/a						x
Statistics Canada	n/a						x
Yukon	Justice Canada	Yuk-1	x				
	Justice Canada	Yuk-2	x				
	Justice Canada	Yuk-3		x			
	Justice Canada	Yuk-4		x			
Totals		**72**	**24**	**20**	**14**	**14**	**3**

APPENDIX E

PROJECTS PROVIDING BEST PRACTICES / LESSONS LEARNED INFORMATION

Projects Providing Best Practices / Lessons Learned

Jurisdiction	Project Title	Project Type	Best Practices?	Lessons Learned?
Alberta	Alberta Family Violence Initiatives & Domestic Violence Registry Project	Multidisciplinary	x	
B.C.	Mentally Disordered Offenders Protocol - Sexual Assaults	Multidisciplinary	x	
B.C.	First Nations Journeys of Justice - An Elementary (K-7) Curriculum	Multidisciplinary	x	x
CACP	Victim Services - Waterloo Regional Police	Multidisciplinary	x	
CACP	Victory Hills Community Garden - Waterloo Regional Police	Multidisciplinary	x	x
CACP	Fast Water, Fast Friends - Waterloo Regional Police	Multidisciplinary	x	
CACP	Values, Influences & Peers - Waterloo Regional Police	Multidisciplinary	x	
CACP	Vision 2000 Police/Youth mentoring Program - Waterloo Regional Police	Multidisciplinary	x	
Manitoba	Queen's Bench (Family Division) Case Management	Multidisciplinary	x	
Manitoba	Custody Coordination Project (Portage La Prairie & Winnipeg)	Multidisciplinary	x	
Manitoba	Manitoba Community Notification Advisory Committee (CNAC)	Integrated	x	
Manitoba	Manitoba Justice Committees	Integrated	x	
Manitoba	Hollow Water Community Holistic Circle Healing Project (CHCH)	Integrated	x	
Manitoba	Mediation Services	Integrated	x	
Manitoba	First Nations Justice Strategy	Multidisciplinary	too early	too early
N.B.	Domestic Legal Aid	Multidisciplinary	too early	too early
N.B.	Public Awareness on Family Violence through Community Partnerships	Multidisciplinary	x	
Newfoundland	Provincial Strategy Against Violence	Multidisciplinary	too early	too early
NWT	Community Justice - Northwest Territories	Multidisciplinary	x	x
NWT	Community Wellness	Multidisciplinary	x	x
Ontario	Peer Mediation	Multidisciplinary	x	x
Ontario	Violence Free Schools Policy	Multidisciplinary	x	x
Ontario	School Based Services	Multidisciplinary	x	
Ontario	Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project	Multidisciplinary	x	x

Projects Providing Best Practices / Lessons Learned Information (continued)

Jurisdiction	Project Title	Project Type	Best Practices?	Lessons Learned?
Québec	The Change in Correctional Approaches at Correctional Services Québec	Integrated	x	
Québec	Supervision and Guidance in Open Custody Project	Integrated	x	
Québec	Compensatory Work Program	Integrated	x	
Québec	Consultation Team on the Administration of Justice for Young Persons	Integrated	x	
Québec	Consultation Committee on the Administration of Criminal Justice	Integrated	x	
Saskatchewan	Regina Aboriginal Human Services Cooperative-operative	Multidisciplinary	x	
Saskatchewan	Saskatchewan's Action Plan for Children	Multidisciplinary	x	
Saskatchewan	The Family and Youth Plan	Multidisciplinary	x	
Saskatchewan	Provincial Partnership Committee on Family Violence	Multidisciplinary	x	
Yukon	Community Based Justice	Multidisciplinary	x	x
Yukon	Coordinating Committee on Family Violence	Multidisciplinary	x	x
Totals:		**n = 35** MJ = 26 IJ = 9	**n = 32** MJ = 23 IJ = 9	**n = 8** MJ = 8 IJ = 0

APPENDIX F

VERBATIM RESPONSES — BEST PRACTICES & LESSONS LEARNED

Verbatim Responses: Best Practices & Lessons Learned

Project	Best Practices	Lessons Learned
Alberta-1 **Alberta Justice Family Violence Initiatives & Domestic Violence Registry Project**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** This is a multidisciplinary approach reflective of the previously identified integrated justice values of: a focused and appropriate use of the justice system; a coordinated community and justice system response; more efficient access to justice services; efficient and effective solutions to specific justice problems; and, use of innovative technologies. Of significance is that the initiatives were developed following consultation and partnership with other services (i.e., police, women's shelters, advocacy groups, *et cetera*).	
BC-2 **Mentally Disordered Offenders Protocol — Sexual Assaults**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** Encouraging the partners in this project to think cooperatively and to deal with all aspects of the subject's situation. This has to be done while ensuring that in order to achieve a laudable objective, there is not unwarranted interference with the subject's autonomy. Criminal Justice representatives, in particular, have to be careful that the justice system is not misused in order to keep controls over an alleged offender "for his own good."	
BC-6 **First Nations Journeys of Justice — An Elementary (K-7) Curriculum**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** In this type of project, the most important element is local involvement, and following proper protocol. First of all, local resource people were asked to contribute to the curriculum, which makes it relevant to those communities. In addition, the curriculum is flexible in that it allows each community to "plug in" much of their own content (in particular, local stories) to make it interesting for the students. Feedback from schools who are using the curriculum comment upon the ease with which the curriculum can be used since the lesson plans are very detailed, while at the same time there is allowance for local input to make it coherent and applicable to that particular community.	The lesson learned had to do with not following proper protocol in some cases. For example, stories must be placed within the context of the curriculum before being verified with Elders as appropriate material to teach a particular concept. Also, once must know the proper channels to go through to get permission to conduct projects in First Nations communities. Finally, the curriculum was launched formally with a traditional ceremony and the participation of Elders, community leaders and justice system leaders.
CACP-1 **Victim Services — Waterloo Regional Police**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** Victims are referred to a credible agency that gives information and support to individuals in a state of crisis.	

Verbatim Responses: Best Practices & Lessons Learned (continued)

Project Code	Best Practices	Lessons Learned
CACP-2 **Victory Hills Community Garden — Waterloo Regional Police**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** The garden project created an increased sense of community for all involved, including police. Over 100 families now participate. Two specific apartment buildings overlooking the garden showed a decrease from 119 occurrences that police responded to in 1993 to 84 occurrences in 1994 — a 30% decrease for the street as a whole: increased awareness of a multicultural society; increased community interaction; increase in the sense of empowerment; increased safety and trust in the community; excellent use of crime prevention through environmental design principle, putting a safe activity into an unsafe area produces a reduction in crime; puts into action the Community Based Policing philosophy that focuses on "planting the seed" to empower community members to use initiative and accept a partnership responsibility in crime prevention.	The lesson learned was that funding for a full time coordinator would be beneficial.
CACP-3 **Fast Water, Fast Friends — Waterloo Regional Police**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** This program is effective because it combines a sense of recreation, adventure and teamwork instead of the usual structured, dry delivery of a desired thought process. Anti-racism measures are seldom effective if forced upon any group. Attitudes of racism are developed over a period of time, influenced by many factors. The relief of this problem must come from a true desire to initiate change or in an opportunity that will embarrass the participants. Due to lack of government financial support, evaluation is performed by limited human resources of the Pine Tree Native Centre and cannot possibly reflect all the changes that this event is responsible for.	
CACP-4 **Values, Influences & Peers — Waterloo Regional Police**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** VIP benefits: accept responsibility for own actions; understand the influence of peer pressure; better decision making skills; aware of importance of self respect and self confidence; interact with others in meaningful ways; understand the dangers of tobacco, alcohol, drugs; and, understand the serious impacts of shoplifting, drugs, vandalism.	

Verbatim Responses: Best Practices & Lessons Learned (continued)

Project Code	Best Practices	Lessons Learned
CACP-5 **Vision 2000 Police / Youth Mentoring Program — Waterloo Regional Police**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** The community is responsible for teaching our youth how to make the right decisions during difficult times. Vision 2000 will try and fulfill many diverse needs in the community and officers will be encouraged to create their own program. The police service can be seen as an advocate of youth who can connect a youth to resources and support. This program has the potential to lead to student employment if funding is found. This entire program could be replicated in almost any police service.	
Manitoba-1 **Queen's Bench (family division) Case Management**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** The consultation process at the very beginning of the concept included the Judiciary, the Family Law Subsection, Courts administration and Planning and Research. Having all of these parties involved at the outset facilitated a more cooperative and comprehensive approach to the overall development and implementation.	
Manitoba-2 **Custody Coordination Project (Portage La Prairie & Winnipeg)**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** As in other projects that have been developed with the Courts, early consultation with all parties affected by changes is paramount. The opportunity to be a stakeholder in projects that are designed to improve the justice system offers persons more of an incentive to ensure that the project is a success.	
Manitoba-3 **Manitoba Community Notification Advisory Committee (CNAC)**	**Integrated Justice project** CNAC has integrated law enforcement, justice, corrections, mental health agencies in the difficult task of assessing when the public need for information to protect itself outweighs the privacy interests of an individual. CNAC personnel have noted that inter-agency cooperation and communication has increased between member-agencies as a result of this initiative. The specific nature of the Committee's tasks, combined with a common protocol and agreed upon policies have resulted in a successful inter-sectoral approach to public protection.	

Verbatim Responses: Best Practices & Lessons Learned (continued)

Project Code	Best Practices	Lessons Learned
Manitoba-4 **Manitoba Justice Committees**	**Integrated Justice project** Key principles leading to the success of justice committees include providing justice committees with a maximum amount of autonomy within the general policy and legal parameters established by Manitoba Justice; providing administrative and training support to committees through liaison probation officers assigned to each committee; diverse expertise and experiences are brought together on each committee; continuity of committee membership, as it is not uncommon to find members with 10-12 years experience; flexibility of the model to operate in rural, urban, and Aboriginal communities; the ability of committees to act quickly following a referral of a case; and, providing a structure to promote and channel community ownership and responsibility for responding to crime and crime prevention.	
Manitoba-5 **Hollow Water Community Holistic Circle Healing Project (CHCH)**	**Integrated Justice project** The success of the CHCH Program is based on a variety of factors, including the successful integration of traditional and contemporary treatment methods; utilizing local resource persons and a team approach to intervention with victims, victimizers and all those affected by sexual abuse; establishing a strong partnership with justice and social service agencies; and, implementing an intervention model which is sensitive to the complex dynamics of sexual abuse. The final intervention model reflects a belief in the power of integrating traditional and contemporary treatment models. Furthermore, the model demonstrates the importance and success of working with the community, justice and social service systems to address this complex problem.	
Manitoba-6 **Mediation Services**	**Integrated Justice project** Key features to the success of Mediation Services include a model grounded in strong theory and practice; high client satisfaction; strong relationship with justice agencies; on-going program and case analysis; and, a comprehensive approach to training and support to its volunteers.	

Verbatim Responses: Best Practices & Lessons Learned (continued)

Project Code	Best Practices	Lessons Learned
Manitoba-7 **First Nations Justice Strategy**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** This is an emerging project but best practices will likely include: increased First Nations involvement in planning change for the justice system will increase their sense of ownership; more culturally appropriate responses to crime in the 26 reserve areas will increase greater impact on offenders; and, diverting less serious offenders to community diversion projects will leave the court to deal with more serious cases.	
NB-1 **Domestic Legal Aid**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** Pending the receipt of the evaluation, it would be premature to identify what we believe are the best practices illustrated in Domestic Legal Aid or features that should be avoided.	
NB-2 **Public Awareness on Family Violence through Community Partnerships**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** The project demonstrated that a contact person to link, motivate and help organize the community volunteers was necessary both to get the programs started and to keep them running. The need for the program to be flexible to meet the different needs of each community was also a critical factor in the program's success.	
Nfld-2 **Provincial Strategy Against Violence**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** The process for implementing the Strategy began in March 1996, with the appointment of a Coordinator and Coordinating Team. As a result, it may be too early to determine best practices. However, it is clear that the philosophy of the strategy is one which emphasizes coordination/integration of governmental efforts and government/community partnerships in prevention and service delivery initiatives. Possible targets for evaluation of best practices, are the four Pilot Projects mandated by the Strategy: the establishment of a multidisciplinary service centre; the establishment of crisis intervention, assessment and referral services at a District Social Services Office; the establishment of an intervention and treatment centre which deals not only with individual victims but with other family members; and, the co-location of staff from one agency to another.	

Verbatim Responses: Best Practices & Lessons Learned (continued)

Project Code	Best Practices	Lessons Learned
NWT-1 **Community Justice — Northwest Territories**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** Community justice, and particularly the community development focus of the work of the Community Justice Division, serves the objectives of crime prevention and a more focused justice system.	The Community Justice Program, when first introduced, lacked focus. The community development approach stresses that communities must identify the action which they propose to take, the community development worker's role is to facilitate and not impose upon the community. However, the community will often be looking for options and some definition to the possible. Moreover, the Department and the other partners to community justice also have interests which must be taken into account. The lack of focus also caused a lack of accountability.
NWT-2 **Community Wellness**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** One of the goals of the initiative is for the territorial government to be less directive in social initiatives; that is, to leave more room for the communities to design and implement appropriate responses to problems. In this context, the territorial government is learning that resources will then not always be spent in the way it thinks appropriate. More importantly, it has become clear that a greater level of support must be provided, both to territorial government, front-line staff and to community groups and individuals, for dealing with the new environment. Because of the serious nature of the social problems and the inadequacy of response, the temptation has been to try to set out to fix everything. From a community development view, it makes more sense to set out more reasonable and achievable goals. It has also become apparent that it is difficult for managers and employees to be seriously involved in major restructuring of the way government does business at the same time as they retain responsibility for program delivery to clients.	

Verbatim Responses: Best Practices & Lessons Learned (continued)

Project Code	Best Practices	Lessons Learned
Ontario-1 **Peer Mediation**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** The most successful projects have a group of mediators who are representative of the entire school population, including those students who have "negative clout." there must be a strong staff commitment. Staff must be involved in screening incidents that may be mediated, mentoring mediators and problem solving with mediators around difficult issues. Students and staff must receive solid initial and refresher training involving lots of simulations and discussion of ethical issues.	Police and Crown attorneys must be involved from the beginning. Police must know the staff and students and must have confidence in the project if they are to see it as a way to keep young people out of the justice system.
Ontario-2 **Violence Free Schools Policy**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** The integration of violence prevention in the curriculum emphasizes that these skills are essential to learning; involvement of the community in the development of the Ministry of Education and Training (MET) policy and each board policy is important to ensure that community values are reflected. It also encourages a whole community approach to violence prevention.	Boards were asked to collect data on the number of serious violent incidents. Categories were provided but boards were advised to develop their own definitions based on discussions with their local police and community agencies. Definitions were to reflect what each community saw as a serious violent incident. This local interpretation has made board comparisons very difficult.
Ontario-3 **School Based Services**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** The limited funding available from the Ministry of Education and Training provides an incentive to both school boards and shelters to work together to provide services. Both the board and shelter contribute additional resources to support the project. the partnerships have resulted in improved community awareness of violence against women and have led to the increased involvement of school boards in community committees to end violence against women. Boards are required to enter into a fee for services agreement with their shelter partner. A limited portion of the funding can be identified for administration, travel and resources. The majority of the funding must go to staff time for direct service.	

Verbatim Responses: Best Practices & Lessons Learned (continued)

Project Code	Best Practices	Lessons Learned
Ontario-4 **Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** The project combines the most effective prevention programs with comprehensive service delivery and community development. The required parts of the model include: regular home-visits to expectant new parents; high quality child care programs; and, in-class assistance for primary school years. However, the local Better Beginnings models are tailored to the needs and cultures of each individual community, and often include: before and after school programs and playgroups; nutrition components: breakfast, snack and lunch programs; cooperative food purchasing; community kitchens; English as a second language programs; and, parent support groups, parent training, and parent education. The Better Beginnings model requires significant parental and community participation. Fifty percent of the members on each planning committee or subcommittee must be volunteers from the community. These volunteers pull in others to participate in the programs and planning. In addition, about 90% of the paid staff consist of low income or former social assistance recipients from the communities. The Better Beginnings model also requires integration of services for families with young children.	These are communities where mistrust of service providers, educators and most professionals is quite high. Under these circumstances, there needs to be a minimum of 50% parents or community residents on every committee or subcommittee in this type if project, to obtain the level of comfort required for meaningful, significant participation of the community members. Service providers and educators must involve parents and community members in planning and implementation from the start of this type of initiative. If there are too few community members are involved, or if they are brought into the decision-making process too late, the trust between professionals and community members will be very difficult to establish.
Québec-2 **The Change in Correctional Approaches at Correctional Services Québec**	**Integrated Justice project** The main elements that appear to have contributed to the success or failure of the initiative are: priority given to the management of staff working in the fulfilment of the mission of Correctional Services; increased support and efforts by the parties involved to integrate their organizational values; a contribution that fits within government approaches, including regionalization and increased efficiency, effectiveness and quality of services; and, efforts to review the process of delivering services to clients.	

Verbatim Responses: Best Practices & Lessons Learned (continued)

Project Code	Best Practices	Lessons Learned
Québec-3 **Supervision and Guidance in Open Custody Project**	**Integrated Justice project** The main elements that appear to have contributed to the success or failure of the initiative are: a rigorous evaluation to select persons eligible for the program; supervision geared to the individual needs of candidates; and, conditions imposed so that the program applies during the transition from the period of custody to the period of parole, if any.	
Québec-4 **Compensatory Work Program**	**Integrated Justice project** The main elements that appear to have contributed to the success or failure of the initiative are: enriched contractual-type relationship with community organizations; development of mechanisms for consultation and co-operation between the Department of Public Security and resources; and, assessment and follow-up at the provincial level and at the regional level.	
Québec-5 **Consultation Team on the Administration of Justice for Young Persons**	**Integrated Justice project** The consensus with respect to the recommendations in the *Jasmin Report*, the desire to act on them, and the need to cooperate in the efforts of the parties concerned with a view to efficiency (i.e., to act on the recommendations in the *Report* effectively and at the lowest possible cost) will certainly contribute to the success of the initiative.	
Québec-6 **Consultation Committee on the Administration of Criminal Justice**	**Integrated Justice project** The main elements that appear to have contributed to the success or failure of the initiative are: member's desire to promote greater consultation in their efforts toward greater effectiveness; and, efficiency (i.e., to obtain better results in the administration of criminal justice at lower cost).	

Verbatim Responses: Best Practices & Lessons Learned (continued)

Project Code	Best Practices	Lessons Learned
Saskatchewan-1 **Regina Aboriginal Human Services Cooperative**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** The project demonstrates the process of community development in the justice context from preplanning, planning development, implementation and evaluation stages. It has taken approximately 2 to 3 years to build this type of consensus through community action so that the organization now has the support to go forward and actually deliver justice alternative measures services. Best practices illustrated by the project are in terms of building Aboriginal community consensus and community development and justice issues, empowering the community and coordinating inter-agency and inter-governmental response to community needs. The project is unique in that it follows a cooperative model of organization rather than a profit corporate structure. This makes it much more open to the community-at-large to be members of the Coop. Overall it improves accountability of the Coop to its membership as well. The project also demonstrates the importance of being familiar with the dynamics of community organizations in change.	
Saskatchewan-2 **Saskatchewan's Action Plan for Children**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** The Steering Committee on the Child Action Plan has developed a workable approach to joint and collaborative government planning on a major social policy area. This has also involved joint budget planning across Departments on a social policy area. As well the initiative has carried out a fairly extensive consultation and community involvement focus including decentralization of authority from the Central committee down to the Regional bodies for providing local grant support. Prevention and support grants summer program, in particular, has been very well received by communities as providing the sort of short-term targeted funding which has helped to significantly decrease crime and disruption in the community.	

Verbatim Responses: Best Practices & Lessons Learned (continued)

Project Code	Best Practices	Lessons Learned
Saskatchewan-3 **The Family and Youth Plan**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** This project emphasized the necessity of having in-depth consultations with the various stakeholders. It also emphasized the need for an evaluation plan which includes the evaluator's involvement from the outset of planning through implementation and follow-up. The tracking of the youth and families involved in the programs, the detailed data collection and analysis, the follow-up of the youth in the programs, and the feedback from the consumers of the services have all proven to be invaluable in evaluation of the program. Of equal value is the regular feedback to the agencies and staff who are providing the services. To a large extent, the issue of target drift was avoided because of this.	
Saskatchewan-4 **Provincial Partnership Committee on Family Violence**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** Through the process of establishing a partnership relationship, it was learned that inclusive membership, listening to others, decision making by consensus, trust building, and developing guidelines are essential ingredients to forming a partnership. There were several barriers to working in a partnership that could have undermined or defeated the partnership process, including: costs to pull people together; determining who should represent the government; determining for whom government representatives spoke (the Department?, themselves?); addressing people's special needs (e.g., child-care, disability access, honorariums, etc.); defining a workable meaning for "inclusivity"; developing a non-hierarchical structure; establishing a decision making process and criterion; defining partnership criteria; and, ensuring accountability for all members/partners.	
Yukon-1 **Community Based Justice**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** Using the Teslin project as an example, a best practice has been to ensure it is the community who offers the suggestions and procedures. The lesson learned is to provide close monitoring and hence encouragement and advise.	The lesson learned is to provide close monitoring and hence encouragement and advise.

Verbatim Responses: Best Practices & Lessons Learned (continued)

Project Code	Best Practices	Lessons Learned
Yukon-2 **Coordinating Committee on Family Violence**	**Multidisciplinary Justice project** Best Practices: All agencies gather at one place and time and on a regular basis. This keeps communication current.	Lessons Learned: It is cumbersome for a large number of agencies to meet.
Totals:	**Best Practices: 35 projects** (26 MDJ & 9 IJ)	**Lessons Learned: 8 projects** (8 MDJ & 0 IJ)

APPENDIX G

SUMMARY ANALYSIS — TYPES OF PROJECTS

Summary Analysis — Types of Projects

Type of Multidisciplinary Justice Project	Characteristic Best Practice	Project Title	Project Orientation / Target	Benefits / Comments
Community Partnership	• flexibility to adapt to community needs • cooperation with credible agencies	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Victim Services — Waterloo Regional Police (CACP-1)	Victims Services: victims of domestic violence / victims of sexual assault / victims of other crimes / non-victims.	assistance to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and other crimes. educates victims to prevent future occurrences.
Community Partnership	• community ownership	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Victory Hills Community Garden — Waterloo Regional Police (CACP-2)	Crime Prevention: diverse community racial / ethnic minorities	increased awareness of multicultural society. increased community interaction. increased sense of empowerment. increased safety and trust in the community. crime prevention through environmental design with reduction in crime.
Community Partnership	• involve recreation in addressing clients needs • anti-racism	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Fast Water, Fast Friends — Waterloo Regional Police (CACP-3)	Police / Community Relations: Aboriginal Youth anti-racism	promotes cross-cultural understanding, anti-racism effectively.
Community Partnership	• community involvement / responsibility • police / youth mentoring	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Vision 2000 Police / Youth Mentoring Program — Waterloo Regional Police (CACP-5)	Crime Prevention / Police-Community Relations: youth	Student Benefits: improved self-esteem, etc. Adult Mentor's Benefits: improved sense of community belonging, etc. Business / Organization's Benefits: improved community relations, etc. School's Benefits: improved student attendance and performance, etc.

Summary Analysis — Types of Projects (continued)

Type of Multidisciplinary Justice Project	Characteristic Best Practice	Project Title	Project Orientation / Target	Benefits / Comments
Community Partnership	• community empowerment • community solutions	**Multidisciplinary Justice** First Nations Justice Strategy (Man-7)	Diversion / Restorative Justice: Reduced use of traditional justice system - First Nations / Aboriginal alternatives	increased First Nations sense of ownership. more culturally appropriate responses to crime. diverting less serious offenders will leave the court to deal with more serious cases.
Community Partnership	• community partnerships • community volunteers	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Public Awareness on Family Violence through Community Partnerships (NB-2)	Family Violence: create awareness Reduce Contact with Justice System: reduce violence	a contact person to link, motivate and help organize the community volunteers was necessary both to get the programs started and to keep them running.
Community Partnership	• community empowerment • community development	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Community Justice — Northwest Territories (NWT-1)	Reduce Alienation from Justice System: Aboriginal Mediation / Restorative Justice: diversion / community based alternatives to the justice system	crime prevention and a more focused justice system. involved communities who are increasingly assuming responsibility for their problems.
Community Partnership	• community empowerment / community development	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Community Wellness (NWT-2)	Prevention: social problems underlying justice problems	prevention of social problems by strengthening the ability of communities to respond to problems. territorial government to be less directive in social initiatives.
Justice System Coordination	• partnership with other services	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Alberta Justice Family Violence Initiatives & Domestic Violence Registry Project (Alta-1)	Family Violence: female victims / offenders / justice system staff	more focused / appropriate use of resources. coordinated community / justice system response. efficient and effective solutions to justice problems.

Summary Analysis — Types of Projects (continued)

Type of Multidisciplinary Justice Project	Characteristic Best Practice	Project Title	Project Orientation / Target	Benefits / Comments
Justice System Coordination	• following proper protocol	**Multidisciplinary Justice** First Nations Journeys of Justice — An Elementary Curriculum (BC-6)	Reduce Contact with Justice System: Aboriginal	flexibility creates ease in adaptation to local community.
Justice System Coordination	• early consultations	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Queen's Bench Case management (Man-1)	Reduce Contact with Justice System: Family Division Court	reduced costs to litigants and the public in general. reduced delays between the initiation and completion of a matter. increased litigant, lawyer, Judge and court staff satisfaction with the court process. reduced number of contested hearings.
Justice System Coordination	• early consultations • stakeholder involvement	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Custody Coordination Project (Man-2)	Improved Security / Reduce Costs: remand centre transports to court	opportunity to be a stakeholder in projects offers more of an incentive to ensure the project is a success. reduced security risk. reduced costs associated with prisoner transfers.
Justice System Coordination	• agreed upon policies • integrated law enforcement, justice, corrections, mental health agencies	**Integrated Justice** Manitoba Community Notification Advisory Committee (Man-3)	Community Safety / Notification (vs. Privacy Interests of Individual): community high-risk offenders	inter-agency cooperation and communication has increased. nature of the task combined with a common protocol and agreed upon policies have resulted in a successful approach to public protection.

Summary Analysis — Types of Projects (continued)

Type of Multidisciplinary Justice Project	Characteristic Best Practice	Project Title	Project Orientation / Target	Benefits / Comments
Justice System Coordination	• providing a maximum of autonomy to partners • providing administrative and training support to partners	**Integrated Justice** Manitoba Justice Committees (Man-4)	Community Justice (e.g., alternative measures): Aboriginal Youth	focused and appropriate use of the justice system. coordinated community and justice system response. more efficient access to justice services. efficient and effective solutions to specific justice problems.
Justice System Coordination	• strong relationship between justice and agencies • comprehensive approach to training and support to volunteers	**Integrated Justice** Mediation Services (Man-6)	Mediation / Restorative Justice: Reduced use of traditional justice system	promote peace and restorative justice by empowering people through education and mediation. resolving conflict using non-violent conflict resolution processes. diverting cases holds significant potential for freeing-up court resources. mediation provides a strong vehicle for victims to take an active role in holding offenders accountable.
Justice System Coordination	• legal aid assistance	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Domestic Legal Aid (NB-1)		minimize people's contact with the traditional justice system. assist abused spouses to leave the abusive relationship, and to encourage the use of ADRs and self-help mechanisms.
Justice System Coordination	• links with partners in court system and community	**Integrated Justice** The Change in Correctional Approaches at Correctional Services Québec (Que-2)	Corrections: regionalization / integration of services	increased efficiency, effectiveness and quality of services. decompartmentalization, integration of services and an increase in the capacity to interact coherently with the environment.

Summary Analysis — Types of Projects (continued)

Type of Multidisciplinary Justice Project	Characteristic Best Practice	Project Title	Project Orientation / Target	Benefits / Comments
Justice System Coordination	• offender supervision on open custody	**Integrated Justice** Supervision and Guidance in Open Custody Project (Que-3)	Corrections: reintegration of offenders	cost-effective way to invest in justice reforms. reduce the problem of overcrowded custodial facilities.
Justice System Coordination	• community participation in the administration of justice	**Integrated Justice** Compensatory Work Program (Que-4)	Corrections: poor - avoid institutionalization for non-payment of fines	reduce the rate of imprisonment for non-payment of fines. promoting links with the community. cost-effective way to invest in justice reforms.
Justice System Coordination	• consistency and coherence across justice agencies	**Integrated Justice** Consultation Team on the Administration of Justice for Young Persons (Que-5)	Justice Administration: youth	consistency of interventions and messages given to young people in the judicial, police and social services. coherent programs in the administration of justice for young people.
Justice System Coordination	• partnership in the administration of criminal justice	**Integrated Justice** Consultation Committee on the Administration of Criminal Justice (Que-6)	Justice Administration: criminal justice	greater consultation in their efforts toward greater effectiveness efficiency (i.e., to obtain better results in the administration of criminal justice at lower cost).
Inter-System Cooperation	• educational approach to crime prevention	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Values, Influences & Peers — Waterloo Regional Police (CACP-4)	Crime Prevention: youth	accept responsibility for own actions. improve decision making skills. awareness of importance self respect and self confidence. interact with others in meaningful ways. understand dangers of tobacco, alcohol and drugs. understand the serious impacts of shoplifting, drugs, vandalism.

Summary Analysis — Types of Projects (continued)

Type of Multidisciplinary Justice Project	Characteristic Best Practice	Project Title	Project Orientation / Target	Benefits / Comments
Inter-System Cooperation	• government / community cooperation • coordination / integration of government efforts	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Provincial Strategy Against Violence (Nfld-2)	Reduce Contact with Justice System: violence - women, children, racial minorities, gays and lesbians and vulnerable adults	reduced violence by prevention, education and early intervention of other community-based social services. facilitate access to justice by victims of violence.
Inter-System Cooperation	• justice / education cooperation	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Peer Mediation (Ont-1)	Reduce Contact with Justice System: youth	alternative to the youth justice system.
Inter-System Cooperation	• justice / education / social services cooperation	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Violence Free Schools Policy (Ont-2)	Prevention: youth violence	all school boards in Ontario now have a violence free schools policy developed and are implementing programs and procedures to support violence prevention.
Inter-System Cooperation	• school / community cooperation	**Multidisciplinary Justice** School Based Services (Ont-3)	Reduce Contact with Justice System: child witnesses to spousal abuse / future abusers	reduced impact on child witnesses to woman abuse / decreased likelihood they will become perpetrators or victims. improved community awareness of violence against women. reduced violence against women.
Inter-System Cooperation	• combines prevention, service delivery & community development	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project (Ont-4)	Prevention / Community Development: First Nation / low income	reducing the increased probability of poor health, social behaviour and school performance. effective prevention will reduce the need for expensive remedial programs such as welfare, mental health treatment, developmental services, special education and corrections.

Summary Analysis — Types of Projects (continued)

Type of Multidisciplinary Justice Project	Characteristic Best Practice	Project Title	Project Orientation / Target	Benefits / Comments
Inter-System Cooperation	• inter-agency and inter-governmental response to community needs	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Regina Aboriginal Human Services Cooperative (Sask-1)	Mediation / Restorative Justice: Aboriginal community development / alternative measures	community empowerment. reducing reliance on the formal criminal justice system. increased use of alternative measures. building the community's capacity to address needs of offenders and victims. collaboration among community agencies and between government and the community.
Inter-System Cooperation	• collaborative process: all major provincial Departments, Regional Committees, local community organizations	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Saskatchewan's Action Plan for Children (Sask-2)	Preventive, Restorative & Educational: well-being of children, youth and families.	joint and collaborative government planning on a major social policy area.
Inter-System Cooperation	• partnership: Justice, Education, Social Services, Health, Finance, various communities, community-based organizations, Indian bands	**Multidisciplinary Justice** The Family and Youth Plan (Sask-3)	Prevention / Reduce Contact with Justice System: youth / Aboriginal youth	reduction in the use of custody and out-of-region private treatment referrals. a reduction in offending behaviour for youth involved in the programs.
Inter-System Cooperation	• partnership: government and community	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Provincial Partnership Committee on Family Violence (Sask-4)	Family Violence: families / communities	inclusive membership, decision making by consensus, trust building, and developing guidelines are essential ingredients to forming a partnership.
Inter-System Cooperation	• comprehensive response to family violence	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Coordinating Committee on Family Violence (Yuk-2)	Preventive, Restorative and Educational: family violence	coordinate and evaluate activities toward a comprehensive response to family violence.

Summary Analysis — Types of Projects (continued)

Type of Multidisciplinary Justice Project	Characteristic Best Practice	Project Title	Project Orientation / Target	Benefits / Comments
Holistic Approaches	• address all aspects of subject's situation	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Mentally Disordered Offenders Protocol — Sexual Assaults (BC-2)	Reduce Contact with Justice System: mentally disordered offenders	encourages partners to think cooperatively.
Holistic Approaches	• integrating traditional and contemporary treatment methods • strong partnerships between justice and social service agencies	**Integrated Justice** Hollow Water Community Holistic Circle Healing Project (Man-5)	Sexual Abuse: First Nations / Aboriginal	focused and appropriate use of the justice system. coordinated community and justice system response. more efficient access to justice services. efficient and effective solutions to specific justice problems. culturally appropriate for Aboriginal communities.
Holistic Approaches	• community empowerment / ownership • coordination of all services and community resources.	**Multidisciplinary Justice** Community Based Justice (Yuk-1)	Reduce Contact with Justice System: Aboriginal / First Nations Mediation / Restorative Justice: Reduced use of traditional justice system	minimizes people's contact with the traditional justice system. community based justice reduces processing costs to allow greater emphasis on healing individuals, families and the community.